THEOLOGY

VOL. LVII DECEMBER, 1954 No. 414

Editorial

THE article on "Missionary Methods in an English Parish" by the Rev. J. C. Wansey, which we published in August, brought us a large amount of correspondence both from within and from without the parish in question. We are sorry not to have been able to publish several more of the letters we have received; we have studied them all carefully and shall make use of some of them now.

As regards the parish of Woodford itself, it seems that the methods which Mr Wansey advocates and applies, whether they are right or wrong, have led to much more acute controversy and division among men of good will and convinced church people than came out in his original article. This controversy concerns local occurrences and personalities, and we should not feel justified in pronouncing upon the merits of it without having undertaken such an investigation on the spot as is not within our powers. Nor can we undertake to provide further space in THEOLOGY for the discussion of these local aspects of the subject.

As regards the wider question of the desirability of applying Mr Wansey's methods in English parishes generally, the letters that have reached us fall into three main classes of opinion. First, there are those that approve enthusiastically and without qualification. For instance, a north country vicar writes that he read Mr Wansey's article "with tremendous interest and appreciation". "Of course he is right. It is a pity that more parish priests do not imitate his methods and realize the complete ignorance, apathy, and even hostility of 80 per cent. of the parishes. It is no good putting one's head in the sand or living in a fool's paradise. Even in my country parish I have for some time adopted the methods he outlines for baptisms and marriages; and the results are similar!"

Secondly, there are those who altogether dispute both Mr. Wansey's analysis and his remedies. "You and I have been brought up in the Church by quite different methods", writes a country rector in the Midlands. "So have tens of thousands of other English Christians now alive, and a still greater company gone before us. How did Dr Hook deal with Leeds, in times worse than these?" "The sometimes parlous state of church life in our parishes has causes more evident than indiscriminate baptism and marriage. Leaving aside the mysterious movements of faith and unbelief which we may hope to control as effectively as the farmer controls the weather, we have (*a*) a Church desperately unstaffed, (*b*) a parochial clergy underpaid, and therefore worried about their homes, their wives, and their children, (*c*) a parochial clergy on the whole ill-educated and unable to command personal respect. These things are enough to cripple any system which centres, like the Anglican system, on the parochial

clergy. . . . The Church has been almost overwhelmed by the social and industrial changes which began in the nineteenth century. In the complex process of adjustment, the crux of the situation is the ministry."

"It is an inevitable consequence of this situation", continues the same correspondent, "that nearly every clergyman suffers from a sense of inferiority and *therefore* tends to assert his authority, and that of the Church, in odd ways. By the majority of his parishioners he finds himself unregarded and despised. But they still stretch out their hands for baptism and marriage. So he says, 'Let us rap them on the knuckles where we can'."

Thirdly, there are those correspondents who more or less dissent from the methods advocated by Mr Wansey, or at least his way of applying them, but who applaud his courage in tackling and forcing attention to a question of vital importance which ought to be pressing heavily on the Church's conscience. Thus the rector of a large urban parish writes: "The importance of Mr Wansey's article lies not so much in the methods described as in the way he has called our attention to the problem of membership in the Church of England—surely the most urgent and difficult of all problems confronting the Church at the present time. The lack of any widespread sense of membership might well be described as the Achilles' heel of Anglicanism; it is the major source of weakness in English-speaking Christianity. . . . Mr Wansey's methods are open to criticism on various grounds and few clergy would support unilateral action in this matter, but he has raised an issue of fundamental importance."

Another correspondent writes: "I read the Rev. J. C. Wansey's article with great interest, and with admiration for his courage in applying the principle he states. Our situation as regards administering baptism and matrimony involves a great strain on the conscience. However willingly parents and young couples listen to our explanation of their meaning, they pay little attention; and are not likely to pay more until we challenge them by an apparent refusal to do what they ask." But he adds: "Would not the general adoption of Mr Wansey's policy change the status of the Church of England from being (in whatever sense) the Church of the Nation to becoming a sect? Not that this is necessarily decisive against the policy; but if this is the result that would follow we ought to be clear that this is what we want. William Temple wrote in a letter to R. A. Knox in 1913, 'I don't believe in the idea of a Church with sharply defined boundaries; its unity is like that of a ray of light—bright in the centre, but ending none knows exactly where!' "

What struck us about Mr Wansey's article was not his advocacy of a missionary strategy for the Church of England, for with that idea we have been for a long time familiar, but its report of what happened when certain disciplinary methods were consistently applied in a large parish over a period of years. It was as a significant piece of documentation that we published the article. Obviously it would be rash to generalize from results in a single parish to what would

happen elsewhere, nor may one assume that the same methods carried out by someone else would have similar results. Another of our correspondents writes: "If the number of adult confirmation candidates be accepted as a test of evangelistic effectiveness, Mr Wansey's figures though excellent are no greater than those produced in many of the parishes using gentler methods. I would hazard the guess that Mr Wansey is the sort of priest who would be successful whatever methods he employed; and that it is he, and not the methods, to whom the credit for evangelism should be given."

For our part, we agree that the Church of England needs under present conditions to adopt a missionary strategy. But what sort of a missionary strategy? Mr Wansey's methods are by no means the only ones that can properly be described as "missionary". We would call attention to the Bishop of Stepney's book *The Parish in Action*, which was reviewed in our October number (pp. 396 f.), and which advocates methods that are equally missionary and, it would seem, at least equally effective, without being so forbidding and refusing and divisive.

In conclusion, we would for the present do no more than note certain points to which insufficient attention has yet been paid in the consideration of this important subject. A missionary strategy and missionary methods ought to take into account the previous experience and beliefs of the society in which they are to be applied. We should distrust anyone who supposes he has settled something by remarking that "England is now a pagan country and must be treated as such". Such a remark (and it is often made) overlooks the difference between a pre-christian and a post-christian society; it is by no means evident that methods which are appropriate in the one are equally appropriate in the other. In the former the tests of church membership are bound to be much simpler than in the latter.

Then again, as several of our correspondents have perceived, before you start talking about missionary methods you should make up your mind whether you believe the Church of England is called to be a national church or a gathered church. A sect or a denomination can be made to look much tidier and more logically impressive than a national church, and this circumstance always causes sects and parties to be more attractive to certain minds than churches whose frontiers cannot be clearly marked. This is not a question of "establishment": sects can be established, and national churches can be disestablished.

Nor does it seem to us that the problems under consideration are at all peculiar to Anglicanism or to English-speaking Christianity. They arise in much the same form in every national church, whether it is Roman Catholic or Protestant or Eastern Orthodox.

Furthermore, in a great church or a national church the administration of Christian ordinances will always be more subject to abuse than in a gathered church or a sect. As a correspondent already quoted says, "If you are going to have sacraments there must be grave risk of their abuse. The Incarnation itself is open to abuse—when the words fell on bad ground—when folk followed our Lord

because he provided a free meal. It is idealism of a dangerous sort to think that one can uphold the honour of the sacraments by fencing the altar and the font."

However, in spite of our doubts about Mr Wansey's particular kind of missionary methods, we cordially endorse the words of a correspondent whom we have not yet quoted. "I do not know," he writes, "how far I should agree with Mr Wansey's methods on close acquaintance with them, but I do think he should get the fullest credit for a courageous and sacrificial attempt to solve the irreligion of our day, and that he should be accorded at least respectful elbow-room by those who agree about the irreligion, but who have nothing to offer relative to its particular solution."

* * * * *

During the past year we have received a good many more letters than usual and on a wide variety of subjects. We are grateful to all who have written to us, not least to those whose letters have not been published. The circulation of THEOLOGY has continued to show a gratifying tendency to increase, but we believe there are still many potential readers awaiting an introduction. May we once again make the suggestion that a year's subscription (only 12s. post free) may prove an acceptable Christmas present?

Teleology and Eschatology

IN much current theological literature there appears to be confusion between teleology and eschatology. Teleology concerns the "end" (*telos*) in the sense of "purpose", "goal", "fulfilment". Eschatology concerns the "end" (*eschaton*) in the sense of "the last" of a series of events, and especially the end of "this present evil age" or the termination of history. The "end" in the teleological sense is different from the "end" in the eschatological sense. The "end" in the sense of fulfilment may come earlier than the "end" in the sense of *eschaton*. The *telos* of a rose is reached when it achieves full maturity of growth and beauty. This happens before the *eschaton* of its life (i.e. its withering and death). Similarly the purpose of history might be conceived as being fulfilled before the last event of history. This would be a kind of "realized *teleology*", not of "realized *eschatology*". Even if the achievement of the purpose and fulfilment of history could be shown to be simultaneous with the end of history in the sense of the *eschaton*, it would still be true that teleology is logically distinct from eschatology.

The classical exposition of teleology is that of Aristotle. "Each thing", he said "is defined by its *telos*" (Eth. Nic. 1115 B 21). That is, the real nature of the acorn is the oak. The *telos* is distinguished from the process of "becoming", as being its goal; yet the goal is somehow immanent or potentially present in the beginning from which it springs. Aristotle's teleological teaching is summed up by a leading Aristotelian scholar as follows:

> "The meaning and nature of everything in the world, whether living creature, instrument, or community, is to be looked for in the end of its being. In the case of an instrument, this is an end desired by the user, and the form of the instrument is in accordance with this end imposed on its matter from without. In the case of a living creature or of a community the end is immanent in the thing itself—for the plant the life of growth and reproduction, for the animal the life of sensation and appetite which is superimposed on the vegetative life, for man and for the human community the life of reason and moral action superimposed on the two others. The explanation of things is to be found not in what they have developed from, but in what they are developing into; their nature is seen not in their origin, but in their destiny."[1]

Aristotle, then, thought of the teleology of human life and history as immanent within the historical process, which evolves according to a principle within it, till it reaches the fulfilment of its purpose and nature. Christian theology has rejected this purely immanentist and evolutionary teleology in favour of a transcendent teleology, according to which the fulfilment of history is achieved, not by a process of evolution within history, but by the intervention of God from above. The purpose concerned is not a mere purpose of nature to be unfolded in its full flowering and fruition by an inevitable evolutionary process, but the purpose of God who guides, controls, breaks up, transforms, and fulfils the process from "without" or "above". This teleology is more like that which Aristotle found in the user's adaptation of his instrument; but inasmuch as human beings are not mere instruments for the Maker's use, but living persons with conscious purposes of their own, they are called into the task and privilege of co-operating with God in the achievement of his purpose, of which he is the sole author.

With these qualifications it would be true to speak of a Christian teleology: and, if it could be shown that the fulfilment of history was achieved in the Incarnation, Death and Exaltation of Christ, it would be true of speak of "realized teleology": but it is a fundamental confusion to speak of it as "realized eschatology". *Telos* can mean "end" in the sense of fulfilment or purpose; *eschaton* cannot.

The obscurity which results from failure to distinguish these two senses of "end" or "finality" may be illustrated by considering together two quotations from works by modern theological scholars: Professor C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, pp. 230–1, and Professor T. W. Manson, *The Servant-Messiah*, p. 63.

Professor Dodd writes:

> "While, however, the New Testament affirms with full seriousness that the great divine event has happened, there remains a residue of eschatology which is not exhausted in the 'realized eschatology' of the Gospel, namely, the element of sheer finality."

Professor Manson writes:

> "In 'realized eschatology' the distinguishing quality of the *Eschaton* is not—if I may coin the word—postremity, but finality . . . this finality is twofold: the *Eschaton* is at once the supreme gift of God to men and the most unqualified claim upon them: it is the final revelation and the final judgment."

[1] Ross, *Aristotle*, 5th ed. rev., 1949, p. 237.

On the same page Professor Manson says that this conception of "realized eschatology" emerges with "some clearness". Actually Professor Manson is not talking about eschatology at all, but teleology. What he calls the *eschaton* is really the *telos*. At first glance these two writers seem to be flatly contradicting one another. Professor Dodd, who invented the phrase "realized eschatology", says that it fails to exhaust the element of sheer finality. Professor Manson says that finality is its distinguishing mark. On closer inspection, however, we see that there is no contradiction. Professor Dodd is using "final" in the sense of *eschaton*, and is, in effect, admitting that "realized eschatology" excludes that which alone justifies the term "eschatology". Professor Manson is using the term "final" in the sense of *telos*, and mistakenly supposes that he is talking about the *eschaton*. It cannot be too emphatically repeated that these two terms are not synonymous. The teleological and the eschatological are distinct categories, neither of which can be reduced to the other.

If it is true that the fulfilment of history has been achieved in the historic saving action of God, in Christ, then we can speak of a "realized teleology" provided that we recognize that the teleology is of the transcendent kind. This "realized teleology" of the life of God's saving activity in Christ and in the Church, inasmuch as it brings to Christians an earnest or foretaste of that life which will be consummated in man beyond the end of history, may be said to carry with it what Professor J. Jeremias aptly calls "a prolepsis of eschatology".[1] The resurrection-life of Christ in the Church, imparted by the gift of the Holy Spirit, is indeed a "prolepsis" or anticipation in part of the fuller heavenly life of the consummation, which will be ushered in by the *eschaton*.

But even the term "realized teleology" is not wholly satisfactory. Is it the whole truth to say that the fulfilment of history has already been achieved? The perfect life and work of Christ himself is, after all, only part of the goal. God's purpose includes something more, the perfection of his Church. This will not be fully achieved "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a fullgrown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Eph. 4. 13). That has not yet been realized. The doctrine of the purpose of God involves a futurist, as well as a realized, teleology.

What is the relation between this *futurist* teleology and eschatology? The perfection of the Church lies in eternity, and therefore cannot be simply synchronized with the end of history. It lies beyond it. The eschatological event, however it may be conceived, will be the final destruction of whatever is worthless and cannot stand in the presence of God, and the final entry of the redeemed into that eternal consummation of life which is God's and man's *summum bonum* and the heavenly goal. The eschatological event will open the door to the complete teleological fulfilment.

A. W. Argyle.

[1] Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas, Bulletin III, 1951, p. 28.

Public Baptism of Infants

In September 1920 both Houses of Canterbury Convocation agreed that a *shortened* and *simplified* office for the Baptism of Infants was required. The 1928 Alternative Office was drawn up in order to meet this requirement. There was little or no controversy over this particular piece of revision. The fact that it displaced the 1662 Office in a large number of parishes shows that to some extent it met this widely felt need for a shorter and simpler service. But there were still those who maintained that this need had not been met as adequately as it should have been.

Writing in 1931, the present Bishop of Sheffield made this criticism: "The Baptismal Service is still uncertain whether it belongs to Paul or to Christ. Its language remains excessively theological, its form prolix. For ordinary folk the language requires to be simplified, while the Calvinist passion for exhortation which runs away with the old service might be further pruned. . . . The revised service is still lengthy and the climax too long delayed."[1] In May 1937, in the Upper House of Canterbury, it was stated that the Commission on the Church and Youth "would welcome a yet shorter and simpler form" of Baptism Service. The President replied that he was not prepared at that moment to introduce a new Prayer Book Measure into Parliament.

Experiences with evacuee children in 1939 revealed the alarming ignorance of the most elementary Christian truths amongst large sections of the population. It was obvious that for many of those who brought their children to be baptized the 1928 Baptism Service contained much that was "not understanded". They were not being confronted with the spiritual challenge implicit in such a service. Even men and women who had been well educated confessed that the real meaning of the service was veiled in obscurity. All this gave impetus to the movement for revising the revision, with the result that several such services have been produced.

This article will be chiefly concerned with two such revisions. One may be described as semi-official. It is the Revised Service provided by the Convocation of York for occasional use, subject to the direction of the Bishop of the Diocese. The other service has not this semi-official status, but it is used in the parish of St Matthew's, Moorfields, with the permission of the Bishop of Bristol.[2] For the sake of convenience these two services will be referred to in this article as *York* and *Bristol* respectively, though readers will bear in mind that the latter service has not the same degree of authorization as the former.

[1] *A Parson's Job*, p. 231. In point of fact the exhortations in the unrevised service are not of Calvinist but of Lutheran inspiration: see Brightman, *The English Rite* (1921 edn.), ii, 726, 732, 734, 744.

[2] Copies of the Bristol ordo can be had from St Matthew's Vicarage, Victoria Avenue, Radfield, Bristol 5, at 1s. per copy. This service has been in use for thirteen years. It is optional. If people wish for the 1662 or the 1928 service they can have it. Since it was first introduced at St Matthew's, the service has spread to other parts of the country; four editions have already been called for.

Some idea of the shape and contents of these services can be gained by placing them in parallel columns side by side with the 1928 Office.

1928	*York*	*Bristol*
1. Preliminary question.	1. Assurance to Minister that the child has not been already baptized.	
2. Exhortation.	2. Exhortation, followed by a short introduction to the Gospel.	2. Explanation, preceded by the reading of Eph. 4. 1–6, and followed by a short charge to the congregation.
3 and 4. Alternative collects.		
5. Gospel, followed by address.	5. Gospel, with no address following.	
6. Thanksgiving and prayer.	6. Prayer.	
7. Address to sponsors.	7. Charge to sponsors (cf. charge at close of 1928).	7. Short address to sponsors.
8. Interrogatories.	8. Interrogatories.	8. Interrogatories.
9. Four prayers.	9. Two prayers.	9. Two prayers for parents and godparents.
10. Blessing of water, preceded by S. Corda.	10. Blessing of water, preceded by S. Corda.	10. Blessing of water, with no eucharistic preface.
11. Naming and baptizing.	11. Naming and baptizing.	11. Naming and baptizing. 11a. Procession to altar.
12. Reception and sign of the Cross.	12. Reception and sign of the Cross. 12a. Blessing of the child.	12. The signing of the Cross. 12a. Reception. 12b. The Kiss of Peace.
13. Declaration that the child is regenerate.		
14. Bidding to thanksgiving and prayer.	14. Bidding to thangsgiving and prayer.	
15. Lord's Prayer.	15. Lord's Prayer.	15. Lord's Prayer. 15a. Apostles' Creed.
16. Thanksgiving and prayers.	16. Eucharistic versicles and responses together with prayer for the home.	16. Thanksgiving and prayer (extempore prayer suggested).
17. Charge to sponsors.		
18. Closing exhortation.		
19. Blessing.	19. Blessing, preceded by versicles and responses. V. Peace be with you all. R. And with thy spirit. V. Let us bless the Lord.	19. Blessing: "May the Lord of his great mercy bless you and give you understanding of his wisdom and peace; may he nourish you with the riches of the Catholic Faith and

1928	*York*	*Bristol*
	R. Thanks be to God.	make you to persevere in all good works; may he keep your steps from wandering, and direct you into the paths of love and peace; and the blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, be upon you and remain with you always."

An examination of this table will show that in the York and Bristol orders there are significant innovations and omissions.

A. *Innovations*

1. A real attempt is made in the exhortations in both services to elucidate the essential meaning and purpose of the Sacrament. The Explanation at the beginning of the Bristol service contains the following passage:

"That we may appreciate how solemn and decisive this occasion is, let us recall the reasons for which Baptism was ordained.

"First, it was ordained as the means whereby Almighty God sets his claim upon those to whom it is administered, to the intent that their lives may be devoted to Christ's Kingdom and to the service of their fellow men.

"Secondly, it was ordained as a sign that Christ's Kingdom is furthered by men who know their own weaknesses and seek in all things the strength of God's Holy Spirit.

"Thirdly, it was ordained as a reminder that the Christian life can only be lived to the full within the fellowship of the Church, with the help of its prayers and sacraments. For without these aids the corruption of our human nature asserts itself and induces us to disobey Almighty God and to follow after selfishness, sin and waste."

It is all to the good to have such a clear statement given at the outset of the service. It might be even better for the minister to aim at giving the gist of it in a short extempore address. But such an address is not always possible. "Babies can yell; at baptisms they frequently do." On such occasions the minister must be content to read the set exhortation and leave those who have the service forms in their hands to follow as best they can. From an Explanation such as that given in the Bristol service they will at least gather that the baptism of a child is not an enterprise to be taken in hand unadvisedly or lightly.

2. In the 1928 service the godparents are reminded of one set of duties at the time when they make the promises, and of a second set of duties at the close of the service. It is an obvious gain to have these separate charges combined as they are in the York and Bristol services.

3. The procession to the altar for the reception of the infant that occurs in the Bristol service may not meet with general approval. In 1662, 1928 and the York orders the whole action of the service takes place at the font. In 1549 the ante-baptism was conducted at the door of the church and this was followed by a procession to the font. To have a procession to the altar is a distinct break with the age-long tradition that for symbolic reasons has confined the action of the baptism service to the vicinity of the entrance to the church. It might be possible to make out a case for a procession to the chancel steps at those times when baptism is administered during Mattins or Evensong. The reception would then take place at that part of the church where in later years the child would be received into full membership of the Church through the laying-on of hands. Such a procession would help to reinforce the exhortation with regard to Confirmation, which so often seems to fall on deaf ears.

4. The blessing that follows the reception in the York service borrows its language from the 1549 service and contains an allusion to the putting on of the Chrisom: "N., the Lord take thee into his holy household, clothe thee with the robe of innocency, write thy name in the book of life, and keep and govern thee evermore."

5. The use of extempore prayer as part of the post-baptismal thanksgiving is suggested in the Bristol service. It is important that godparents should be led to see that the Lord's Prayer which follows the Baptism is an Act of Thanksgiving and Dedication—a Dedication which should include their own lives with the life of the child. Carefully chosen biddings before the Lord's Prayer will help the godparents to see the relevance of the familiar words of the Family Prayer, so that they may say them with greater reality.

6. Two of the most commendable features of the York service are the repeated element of thanksgiving and the frequent use of dialogue between minister and people. The whole service breathes the spirit of the ancient Easter greeting: "The Lord is risen." "The Lord is risen indeed."

B. *Omissions*

1. One criticism of both services is that certain omissions tend to weaken the emphasis on God's action in the Sacrament. For example, 1662 and 1928 both link the promises made by the godparents with the promises made by Christ. "Our Lord hath promised in his Gospel to grant all these things that you have prayed for; which promise he, for his part, will most surely keep and perform. You, on your part, must undertake on behalf of this infant three things . . ." As a nation we are naturally inclined to Pelagianism. Is it wise to leave out any reference to the grace of God before the godparents are asked to make their promises? Both York and Bristol contain a prayer after the promises have been made that God will strengthen the godparents to do what they have promised. But is this sufficient?

2. Students of the Gorham controversy will note with interest that both York and Bristol omit the words: "Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this child is regenerate (1928—born again)." The open-

ing words of the post-baptismal thanksgiving in the York service imply a doctrine of baptismal regeneration.

3. The Bristol order omits any reference to our Lord's blessing of the children. Many will regard this omission as a defect in this order. As the order for one of the Gospel Sacraments it should surely contain some such passage from the Gospels as Mark 10. 13 and the following verses.

4. In both York and Bristol all reference to Paul's teaching about baptism in Rom. 6 has been excluded. Is this break with tradition necessary? Dr H. D. A. Major, in *Prayer Book Services Revised*, has shown how it is possible to retain this reference. It occurs in the prayer which follows the Lord's Prayer in his suggested order: "We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to receive this child into thy holy Church. And humbly we beseech thee to grant that he may be brought up to lead a godly and a Christian life, and may follow the example of our Saviour Christ, and be made like unto him that as he died and rose again for us, so may we all who are baptized die from sin and rise again unto righteousness, continually mortifying our corrupt affections, and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living."

Brevity and simplicity were the two requirements set before those who were entrusted with the production of the 1928 service. To these two requirements may be added a third—relevance to life. The service must be in a language understanded of the people and must speak to their condition. At the same time the service must not be denuded of the element of mystery. It is possible to pay too high a price for intelligibility, if intelligibility is purchased at the expense of mystery. Those who compiled the York and the Bristol services may be congratulated on having produced sacramental rites which are intelligible and at the same time are imbued with a spirit of liturgy and devotion. In both these rites the element of mystery has been retained.

It will be seen that, while York and Bristol lay themselves open to criticism with regard to certain details, both services contain valuable ideas and suggestions; and these ideas and suggestions deserve to be adopted in any future Baptism Service that is authorized for use by the whole Church. Of the two services, York, by reason of its closer approximation to the 1928 service, will be more likely to commend itself to the majority of the clergy rather than the Bristol service. But the Bristol service will make a special appeal to those who work in industrial parishes and are appalled by the wellnigh impassable gulf between the Church and the man who stands by the conveyor belt. They will be more than grateful to the Vicar of St Matthew's, Moorfields, for his brave attempt to produce a service which the common people will listen to gladly.

L. Hickin.

Women and the Ministry

Two articles in the September number of THEOLOGY, by Dr Sherwin Bailey and Miss M. E. Thrall, examine the theological principles governing the questions of "Women and the Church's Lay Ministry" and "The Ordination of Women to the Priesthood". The present writer is quoted in the former as having urged upon the Church Assembly in a recent debate the necessity for treating these questions theologically; and it may not be inappropriate for him to welcome these two essays and offer some comments upon them.

The appeal to theology may sometimes labour under a not altogether undeserved suspicion of being made in order to defer unwelcome decisions to the Greek Kalends. Nevertheless it is necessary to emphasize that a quick cut-and-dried answer to practical questions cannot always be obtained, as if theology were a kind of slot machine. The surest and most reliable theological judgments are those which are arrived at not under the pressure of such demands but in the process of surveying a wider field. A century ago Delitzsch, in his monumental *System of Biblical Psychology*, gave to the world a study of human nature in all its phases as portrayed in Scripture. The question of the admission of women to the Ministry is not of course so much as glanced at, let alone discussed; but the meaning of man's sexuality and the relationship of the sexes from the spiritual point of view is necessarily included in the survey. No one reading this book could doubt that, within his own terms of reference, the author has incidentally given an answer to the theological questions involved in these ecclesiastical problems of today; nor could he fail to see the danger of arguing from a few scattered texts drawn from the Old and New Testaments. Since Delitzsch's day there has been as great an advance in psychological as in biblical studies. Opinions would differ radically about the validity for our generation of his method of approach and of the conclusions he reached. But at least his work serves to show the need for a theological study of man in his wholeness, in which the relationship of the sexes shall be treated in the light of all the evidence available. It is only in this context that there can be a satisfactory elucidation of the principles governing the smaller question of women and the Ministry. It is because Dr Bailey shows himself concerned with the theology of sexual relations as a whole, and not just with this particular issue, that his work is most to be welcomed.

The two articles make clear that there is one issue of principle of fundamental importance which underlies the discussion: whether, in the order of creation, man is, or is not, to be regarded, as St Paul says, as the "head of the woman".

Miss Thrall, in her main argument for the ordination of women to the priesthood, puts forward the view that priesthood is bound up with "dominion"; that the dominion of the male over the female is an incident of the fallen condition of humanity (Gen. 3. 16), properly reflected in the Law of the Old Covenant; that this is done away in

Christ; and that therefore it is proper that in the Christian Church the priesthood should be given to woman as a sign of the dominion restored to her equally with man in the new order. Her argument, on its premises, is both lucid and cogent. But it starts from, and depends upon, the assumption that "dominion" is all of one kind—that represented by man's relationship to chattels in his possession—so that a subordinate state is necessarily servile. The passages of Scripture which have been taken to signify that man has been given by God in creation a certain primacy or headship over woman are simply disregarded—possibly because they are considered in the preceding article by Dr Bailey. The effect of this omission however is serious, as it goes to the root of the whole matter under discussion. It is clear that in the scriptural view there is a servile element in woman's status which is the consequence of sin, reflecting the servile state into which, from sonship, man himself has fallen. From both servitudes Christ has won redemption, though manifestly the outward effects of bondage are not in this life simply abolished. But just as man's fallen condition of servitude is the perversion of a creaturely state of filial dependence upon God, so it is at least possible that the fallen servitude of woman only exaggerates, perverts, and masks the true subordination to man which is her place in creation. In this case the proper meaning of that "headship" of man spoken by St Paul can be seen only in Christ, when the partnership of the sexes is freed from the false pattern of domination and servitude with which sin has overlaid it. Such "headship" may be a form of "dominion", if that word is desired; but it is a constitutional dominion—one in which the element of responsibility, care, and respect for personal freedom predominates over all else. Even in the Old Testament one remembers how Abraham is bidden to hearken to Sarah in all she has to say about Hagar and her child. In the New Testament the Holy Family gives the supreme example of one standing in the position of husband and father, having to exercise the grave responsibilities of headship even though he must have known how much greater than he were those committed to his care. Every parish priest has to tread a similar path in his pastoral charge.

How does Dr Bailey treat this issue? He frankly recognizes that a "theory of subordination" appears in certain Pauline Epistles and in 1 Peter. But he regards this as merely a rationalization of the social outlook of contemporary Judaism, supported in St Paul by a Rabbinical exposition of the second creation story in Genesis 2. Similarly he argues that Genesis 2 and 3 are themselves to be regarded as a reflection in mythological form of woman's actual situation in the ancient world.

Students of modern theological theories are not strangers to this sort of hypothesis. One is bound however to ask whether it is supported by any positive evidence, and those who seek it in Dr Bailey's article are doomed to disappointment. Much is said to explain away, by means of such hypotheses, the passages of Scripture which tell in favour of the traditional view of subordination; but there is not much solid reason shown for reaching any other conclusion. The

most positive argument is the claim that the relationship is one of partnership, of "confrontation and complementariness", for which the classical authority is the account of creation in Genesis 1. But why is it to be assumed that "complementariness" rules out a principle of subordination? The scriptural analogy of head and body, used by St Paul, precisely gives the lie to this assumption; for in that the principle of mutual interdependence is at least as obvious as that of super- and sub-ordination.

Dr Bailey rightly reminds us (p. 328 v) that we all bring to the discussion of these questions underlying reactions which help to determine our conclusions. Those who hold to the traditional view must reckon seriously with the possibility that their convictions are conditioned by some unconsciously self-willed bias and that the general practice to which the Church still adheres (and from which there is little sign that the majority of churchmen wish to swerve) is similarly rooted in the androcentricity which Dr Bailey discerns in human society and which he ascribes widely to sin. But it is not a light thing to assume that in matters of such spiritual significance the apostolic witness was vitiated by sin. The comparison with the New Testament attitude to slavery is not convincing. Indeed, an examination of what is said on this subject only serves to throw into relief the very different treatment of sexual relationship. The practical duties of those who find themselves in the position of masters or slaves are dealt with; and the condition of the slave is used to illustrate both the bondage of sin and the completeness of the service owed by the Christian to the Lord who has redeemed him. But nowhere is slavery spoken of in terms which suggest a human relationship rooted in the order of creation and affording an insight into the very nature of the godhead. Yet with the institution of marriage and the relationship of the sexes it is otherwise. Nobody reading 1 Corinthians 11 or Ephesians 5 could suppose that St Paul conceived himself to be starting from observed social conditions of his own generation in order to penetrate or explicate divine truths. It seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that he at any rate believed himself to be starting from God's authentic self-revelation in order to understand and explain relationships in the created world. That he was wrong here, and the whole New Testament Church with him, is a verdict to which we should be constrained only by an overwhelming weight of evidence.

There are indeed points in Dr Bailey's argument which strain the bounds of credulity. He argues, for example, on page 325 that in representing Christ as the Bridegroom of the Church St Paul intends to imply nothing more than the closest union as characterizing marriage. Does he really wish us to understand that, but for transient social conditions, the Church might have been described as the Bridegroom and our Lord as the Bride?

It is plain, I think, that in his whole argument Dr Bailey's main positive stimulus is that which comes from his personal insight into the nature of sex and marriage—a field of study which he has made peculiarly his own. But if this argument is to move the Church from

her traditional attitude, it surely needs to take a more objective and articulated form. Is it in fact true that the knowledge of the sexes and their relationship available to man today provides evidence that the traditional view is radically wrong? That is what Dr Bailey is asking us to believe. Is the evidence supplied by the study of psychology so unanimous? One cannot leave out of account the testimony of not a few practising psychotherapists that marriages often break down today simply because the husband will not take the particular responsibility of "headship" which nature requires of him.

The particular Pauline injunctions about the place of women in the Church are rightly separated by Dr Bailey from the issue of principle. They are of course the application of the latter to the circumstances of the Church as St Paul knew it. If the principle no longer stands, no more can they. If the principle is acknowledged, it is still posible that in one or another point the practical situation has so changed as to warrant a different application. This is most likely to hold in a matter specially subject to everyday fashion, such as headdress. But it is unsatisfactory that alterations of practice should be made step by step without ever facing the questions whether the underlying principle still holds, and, if it does, how it should apply under present conditions. The opening of the post of Licensed Reader to women is merely one further step of this kind. Its advocates will often repudiate with perfect sincerity, as Miss Thesiger claimed in the Church Assembly debate, any desire to open the priesthood to women. Yet the main line of the argument in these two articles is essentially one. It seems clear that the denial of the scriptural doctrine of the "headship" of man, which Dr Bailey makes his principal argument in support of women sharing in the lay ministry, must, if fully accepted, lead by Miss Thrall's process of reasoning to women's admission to the priesthood.

No doubt there are others who would reject Dr Bailey's main point of principle and yet hold that under modern conditions it would be a harmless and useful concession to allow women to read the Office and preach in the parish church. To discuss this fully in all its aspects would take us outside the scope of this article. But it may briefly be suggested that if a headship has been given to the male sex by God in creation, there is at least a certain propriety in entrusting the conduct of the formal public acts of the Church's worship to men. Such a conclusion certainly seems to cohere most closely with St Paul's doctrine. Further, the very idea of a commission to represent the Body of Christ as a whole, whether in worship or preaching, with its element of formality and transcendence of what is personal and particular, is characteristically masculine. The Church's Office, of course (unlike the Liturgy), can be used informally; and then there is no impropriety in the lead being taken by a woman. In every age too there have been women who have in fact been called to teach the Church divine truths and deepen her spirituality by the exercise of a personal and prophetic ministry outside the context of corporate worship. Yet the formal commission to teach in the Church's name

and lead her worship is of a different kind; and it may be thought that God has given to such women an essentially feminine contribution to make which would only be obscured and hindered by these masculine trappings.

In conclusion, it should be added that there is much in Dr Bailey's article, and finely said, about woman's place as "the other" without whom man cannot exercise his ministry in the priesthood or elsewhere. The last paragraph is particularly to the point here. No priest can be in any doubt that his ministry needs the complementary ministry of women in order to be properly fruitful, or that the woman's contribution is every bit as important and as exacting in gifts of ability and grace as his own. But will this feminine contribution be best made by women forcing themselves into traditional masculine moulds? At the end Dr Bailey leaves one in doubt whether he is indeed seeking this. He rather seems to suggest that once it were acknowledged that women could be admitted to perform the functions previously restricted to men, their full complementary ministry would develop along other lines. But if that is so, is it not at least possible that it is along these other lines that progress should be made at once, and that the Church's traditional insistence that some functions are meant for men does after all correspond with the purpose of God in which the two sexes are designed not to be identical and interchangeable, but complementary? G. F. Hilder.

The Strange Life of J. K. Huysmans[1]

In the ninth volume of the *Bibliographie des Auteurs modernes de Langue française* forty-seven pages are devoted to Huysmans. It is, therefore, surprising that Mr Laver's is the first full-length study of him to appear in English. Perhaps the explanation of this gap in our literature is that Huysmans, in spite of his Dutch background, is so essentially Parisian that at first sight he appears to have little to say to us. One must add to this the difficulty one has in reading him; not only is he fond of the most *outré* and uncommon expressions and of using them in a sense peculiar to himself, but he is never above coining a word when he cannot find one to express the exact and sharp shade of his meaning.

The interest in Huysmans, however, lies more in what he was than in what he wrote, even allowing for the fact of the autobiographical nature of much of his writing. His life poses universal problems, and this no doubt accounts for the devotion to him which exists in France nearly fifty years after his death.

Huysmans was born in Paris in 1848, of mixed Dutch and French parentage. His childhood and youth were not particularly eventful, though one may see in them much of the shape of things to come.

[1] James Laver, *The First Decadent, being the Strange Life of J. K. Huysmans* (Faber and Faber, 25s.).

He was called up in the Garde mobile de la Seine in 1870, and gives an account of his experiences in the short novel *Sac au Dos*. In 1871 he entered the Ministry of the Interior where he continued, doing work for which he did not even pretend an interest, for the next twenty-seven years. He was awarded the Legion of Honour not because of his writings, as Mr Laver suggests, but in spite of them.

In 1874 he published his first book, at his own expense, *Le Drageoir aux Epices*. This was followed, in 1876, by *Marthe, Histoire d'une Fille*, which, while not being one of his important works, was yet to have an important effect for him personally. It was the history of a Paris prostitute, written in the manner of the naturalist school, then being popularized by Zola and the Goncourt. Huysmans was at once brought into touch with this group of writers. He and Zola became firm friends and, although Mr Laver plays it down somewhat, the recently published correspondence between Huysmans and Zola shows that, at least from a literary point of view, Zola had great influence on him.

"Naturalism" means what it says. The naturalists were in open reaction from the romantic school; they were doing for letters what Hogarth did for drawing. They attempted to depict the contemporary scene as they saw and experienced it, and if, like Hogarth, they seemed unduly preoccupied with the more sordid aspects of that scene, that was part of their reaction and their revolt. Most of them were philosophically atheist, and while Huysmans was probably not so, he determinedly shut himself off from anything which was not of natural experience.

Huysmans remained wedded to the naturalists at least until 1884; his *En Ménage*, which appeared in 1881, is described by Réné Dumesnil as a "roman d'un naturalisme 'saignant' ". In 1884 there appeared signs of a change, leading up to that extraordinary series of events which lifts Huysmans from being simply a novelist to being a figure of real religious significance.

In 1884 he published *A Rebours*, a strange book translated into English as *Against the Grain*, and which profoundly influenced Oscar Wilde in the writing of *The Portrait of Dorian Gray*. The book, though founded partly on the odd life of Count Robert de Montesquiou, was one of imagination rather than of observation. Mr Laver says that the book displeased Zola, who saw in it the loss of a disciple. He does not, however, quote the letter which Zola wrote to Huysmans immediately after reading the book. After some small criticism of the style, Zola says: "In short, you have given me three very happy evenings. This book will rank at least as a curiosity in your work; be proud of having done it. What will people say to you about it? If they do not keep quiet they could very well make a whole devil's sabbath out of it, or throw it at your head and ours as the final putridity of our literature. I think I feel some drivel in the air."[1]

But a devil's sabbath, complete with all its lurid detail, was just

[1] *Cahiers J-K. Huysmans*, March 1942, reprinted in *Lettres inédites à Emile Zola*, ed. Lambert (Geneva, 1953).

what was to come next, although Zola did not know it. From 1884 onwards Huysmans was straining against the shackles of the naturalist philosophy. He was seeking something beyond naturalism, but did not know where to find it. He had no leanings whatever towards the Church: "I was not educated in clerical schools but in a lycée; I was never pious in my youth, and memories of childhood and of the first Communion which frequently play so large a part in conversion, played no part in mine. . . . I did not know any practising Catholic, or any priest; I felt no divine hand guiding me towards the Church. I lived at my ease in my sty; it seemed to me quite natural to satisfy the impulses of my senses, and the thought that such adventures were forbidden never entered my head."

In spite of all this, the supernatural began to hold for him all the attraction that the natural had once held. Where, then, should he seek it? He sought it in occultism. His friend Gustave Boucher had tried to make him a Spiritualist, and he attended certain séances without, one imagines, getting much satisfaction out of them, though in time becoming convinced of the reality of the phenomena produced.[1] He wished to write a book on Satanism, and to do this he needed documentation, and thus was brought into contact with a remarkable group of people. Mr Laver has evoked very well the extravagant atmosphere of these Parisian occultists of the late nineteenth century. With most of them, Eliphas Levi, Papus, Sar Peladan, Stanislas de Guaita, Wirth and the rest, Huysmans had little to do except at second-hand. Dr de Lezinier records an interesting conversation with him on the subject, in which he pours ridicule on them all.[2]

Huysmans turned to the sworn enemies of these people, and most notably had dealings with three: Madame Berthe Courrière, who was part of the model for the satanic Madame de Chantelouve of the novel when written; Abbé Roca, a renegade priest and founder of a Socialist Church, who is in part the model for the Satanist Chanoine Docre of *Là-Bas*; and, most important of all, ex-Abbé Boullan, who occasionally used the *nom de plume* of Dr Johannès, under which title he appears in *Là-Bas* as the exorcist who seeks to combat Satanism by occult means.

Boullan was a disciple of the heresiarch Elie Vintras, who claimed to be possessed of the spirit of the Prophet Elisha and who had some following; a sect of Vintrasians was certainly meeting in Paris as late as 1952. It is unfortunate that Mr Laver's documentation on Vintras and Boullan is not good; on the former he ignores the standard work, *Vintras, Hérésiarque et Prophète*, by Maître Maurice Garçon, while on the latter he appears not to have read important articles in the *Bulletin de la Société J-K. Huysmans*, nor to have sought out new material, of which a vast amount has recently come to light. This is particularly unfortunate, because studies by M. Louis Massignon and

[1] See, e.g., *Une Séance de Spiritisme chez J-K. Huysmans* by Boucher, which took place in 1892, a few months only before Huysmans' final capitulation to Catholicism.

[2] *Avec Huysmans: Promenades et Souvenirs*, ch. x.

M. Pierre Lambert have shown the important, and perhaps decisive, role that Boullan played in Huysmans' religious development.

Boullan was an enigmatic and remarkable character. He was a priest, Doctor in Theology, a Missionary of the Precious Blood and a faith healer, who had been degraded and excommunicated by the Archbishop of Paris in 1875. He claimed to be the incarnation of St John the Baptist and the successor of Vintras. There is no doubt that he persuaded Huysmans of the rightness of using "white" magic to counteract "black", and although Huysmans participated in the strange ritual, the "Sacrifice du Gloire de Melchizedek", he appears not to have taken part in any of Boullan's less reputable rites which have been adequately described as "hystéricopornographie". But Huysmans did enter with some zest into occult practices which were at best dubious. How far he acted with his tongue in his cheek it is difficult to say, but the outward scepticism which he showed from time to time with regard to Boullan's charms and spells was probably more apparent than real. At any rate, when Boullan died suddenly of a heart attack in 1892, Huysmans gave an interview to a newspaper in which he accused the occulists of the Rosy Cross of having killed him by magic.

With Boullan's death came disenchantment. Huysmans received a great part of his papers, and he found that the man he had respected as a single-minded, if unorthodox, exorcist, was himself dyed with the deepest dye of debauchery and diabolism.[1]

Mr Laver says that Huysmans continued to believe that Boullan was on the side of the angels. Having read the papers and private dossiers, of course Huysmans did nothing of the kind. He had previously known of abnormalities, M. Massignon tells us, but not "de l'affreux infanticide, commis au terme de la Messe sur le fœtus dont A. Ch. avait accouché à la Consecration. Et surtout pas l'abus systematique de son pouvoir sacerdotal, torturant l'âme de ses dirigées, 'pour voir' ".[2] Huysmans, on the other hand, since the publication of *Là-Bas*, was veering more and more towards the Catholic Church. Boullan's part in this had been not only to convince him of the reality of spiritual phenomena, but also to convince him of the strength of sacerdotal power—as Satan fallen remains a witness to the divine order, says M. Massignon. It was therefore that Huysmans, recognizing his curious debt, seldom spoke against Boullan. The priestess of the cult, Maman Thibaut, was taken into Huysmans' home as housekeeper after Boullan's death. Mr Laver suggests that this was part of Huysmans' whitewash of Boullan. It was nothing of the sort; it arose from that feeling of debt of which we have spoken, and also in the hope of saving her soul. This is made quite clear in his correspondence with Abbé Ferret,[3] and was part of a process

[1] Most of these papers are unpublished; some are in the archives of the Inquisition in Rome, but a number are preserved in the collection of M. Pierre Lambert, and very curious reading some of them make!

[2] "Huysmans devant la 'Confession' de Boullan" in *Bulletin de la Société J-K. Huysmans*, 1949.

[3] Daoust, *J-K. Huysmans et son Confesseur*, pp. 12–13.

which culminated in his refusing drugs during his cancer that he might offer his sufferings for Boullan's salvation. It is true that he did allow her to practise certain odd rites in her room, probably at this time he thought them unimportant, and in any case his letters to Ferret show a remarkable pastoral sense in dealing with them. Why Mr Laver says that we do not know what became of Julie Thibaut I do not know; she remained with Huysmans until he went to Ligugé, when he took the opportunity of sending her back to her people in the Pyrenees where she died.

Curiously enough it was Madame Courrière who, if we are to believe *Là-Bas*, had introduced Huysmans to the Black Mass (and I am inclined to agree with Mr Laver that he did assist at such a ceremony as he describes), who gave him his first real push into the Catholic Church. She it was who introduced him to that remarkable priest, Abbé Mugnier, a priest with enlightened literary tastes and, what must surely have been rare among the clergy of his day, an admiration for George Sand. Abbé Mugnier himself has left us an account of his first interview with his somewhat prickly penitent. It took place in May, 1891. Huysmans said to him: "I am going to publish a satanic book, full of black masses. I want to do another which shall be white. But first I must get white myself. Have you some chlorine for my soul?" And he murmured in an untranslatable Huysmansian phrase, "J'ai des atavismes religieux." He spoke of Zola: "One day I spoke to him about death, and I saw him blench. But what has one got to fear from death if one is a materialist? For myself, I am not, but I've a sick soul and I am not proud of myself."

Abbé Mugnier was very wise. He made no attempt to rush Huysmans, and avoided the temptation which so many priests would have had of trying to hear his Confession there and then. It was more than a year later, with Huysmans darting now forward now back, that he finally got him to the point of making a retreat and confession at the little Trappist monastery of Notre Dame d'Igny. It is all set out by Huysmans in his novel *En Route*.

There remained to Huysmans fifteen more years of life. He had embraced the Catholic religion and, characteristically, there were no half-measures about it. Not that he was an easy convert. His style of writing was too much part of himself for him to change it, and many things he wrote looked strange to pious eyes. Attempts were made to get some of his writings condemned at Rome, but he had powerful friends and nothing happened. He was also widely attacked on the ground that his conversion was merely a literary device, necessary to a naturalist if he were to write about the Church, and a certain Abbé Belleville wrote a pamphlet on this line, making up in unction what he lacked in knowledge and imagination.

The life of the cloister attracted Huysmans, partly, at least, on account of his interest in liturgy and love of Gothic art and Gregorian music. But he clearly had not the vocation of a monk. He compromised by becoming a Benedictine oblate, and living for two years in a little house he had built close to the Benedictine Abbey of Ligugé, only leaving when the abbey closed following the Wal-

deck-Rousseau law of 1901. There followed a rather weary and uncomfortable pilgrimage from lodging to lodging, and then a death as remarkable as any in the annals of sanctity, described by Ludovic Bron as having the splendour and serenity of a Bach prelude. He died slowly of a peculiarly horrible cancer of the mouth, piercing the depths of the mystery of suffering, delighting to offer every moment of it for his own sins and for those of others.

Mr Laver's book is a good introduction to Huysmans if it serves to whet the appetite for a more complete study of him, as I have no doubt it will. It is unfortunate that in giving us further material for study in his bibliography he is not a sure guide. Some of the most important books on Huysmans are not mentioned, notably Miss Helen Trudgian's *L'Esthétique de J-K. Huysmans*, a work of far wider scope than its title indicates. René Dumesnil's *La Publication d' 'En Route' de J. K. Huysmans* is at least as important as the books listed here, while the *Bulletin de la Société J. K. Huysmans* is, though mentioned once in the text, inexplicably omitted from the bibliography. It is one of the best-conducted reviews of its kind in France and continually produces new material; a study of it more profound than he appears to have made would have saved Mr Laver from many minor errors of fact and of judgment. Finally, it is a pity, since this is an introduction for English readers, that there is no mention of the English translations of Huysmans' works.

HENRY R. T. BRANDRETH, O.G.S.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. A. W. Argyle is Tutor and Librarian of Regent's Park College, Oxford.

The Rev. L. Hickin is Vicar of St Stephen's Church, Selly Hill, Birmingham.

The Ven. G. F. Hilder is Archdeacon of Taunton.

The Rev. H. R. T. Brandreth is Chaplain of St George's Church, Paris.

CORRESPONDENCE

MORE ABOUT PARABLES

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Mr Wiles has done well to remind us in your September issue that the task of employing the thought forms and imagery of our contemporary age in worship is one of the utmost difficulty. I hope he will forgive me if I suggest he has not yet begun to tackle it adequately. His fantasies, as he rightly calls them, are deplorable. Our thinking must indeed be dealt with at a much more radical level than he seems to envisage.

We dare not say that God might have become incarnate at this time or at any other than that in which Jesus of Nazareth did in

fact come, or that it might have taken some other form. The spirit of theological relevance must be relevant first to its own origins.

Mr Wiles quotes the preposterous equation of sheep with seals in the Eskimo version of the Gospels. A vigorous protest needs to be made against the translation of the Lamb of God into God's baby seal whereby the sacrificial significance of the lamb is completely lost.

The good shop steward is not in the same category of thought as the good sheep owner; and the less said about "God our deep air-raid shelter" the better. How often did we preach during the war, and how truly, that such an image is hopelessly misleading. God is not a cryptic asylum to be cowered in when evil assails us, but the strength with which we clothe ourselves to go out and fight it.

However out of date crucifixion as a mode of execution may be, people will always understand what a cross is and something of what it means in Christian life and worship.

It does seem odd that the more education people have the more we have to explain things to them and the less able they are to think for themselves. But is it really so? Is there something in people of today that prevents their understanding the Bible stories (including those of Ananias, Azarias and Misael) when they are told them? Are they in fact as dim-witted as all that?

By all means let the teachers of today, like our Lord and the Prophets, use the things with which their hearers are familiar to illustrate eternal truths of which they can be seen as signs, but let them make sure that their stories are real signposts to the point they wish to teach, and let them be very careful how they introduce their modern images into their worship.

Our Lord was concerned with natural and basic phenomena, which have not ceased to be natural and basic. The industrial processes and organizations, from which we are asked to take our parables, are several stages removed from nature and are vitiated by human misdirection. I do not deny that they can be used as modernists wish, it is only that I want to see them used with real spiritual perception and not with a slick surface appropriateness.

As for the Gospel parables themselves, I suggest that they can no more be brought up to date than the miracles or the Passion. They are our Lord's own pictures for himself and his kingdom, and it is much more profitable to try imaginatively to translate the man of today into their surroundings than them into his.

Yours faithfully,

GORDON SAYLE.

GOATHLAND VICARAGE,
YORK.

MASSING PRIESTS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I agree with Mr Collins. There is much to be said for a voluntary priesthood. Mr Welbourn, last May, began to say it. But he ended up by giving us a local public-spirited presidency.

Is it not a valid objection to say that if a man's suitability to preside at the Eucharist is made to depend upon the ability and success with which he presides at other functions, the greater is made to depend on the less? And for the Eucharist to be the offering of the whole Church, the president *must* derive his authority to preside from his sacerdotal office.

To ask, as Mr Collins does, whether the permanent leaders of the local church must always be kept in the ranks of the faithful laity is to open a very urgent question, especially in the face of our present situation. But to attempt to answer it merely by saying that the Apostles ordained elders in every church does not get us much further. These local churchmen were not elders until they were ordained, they owed their eldership entirely to their ordination, and, however distinguished they may have been in public life within their own locality, there was no reason why any *other* local church should accept their ministrations except that they had received apostolic ordination.

What I am concerned to emphasize is not that a stipendiary priesthood is a *sine qua non* of the Church, but that, in any voluntary clergy, the requirement that "they be apt and meet for their . . . godly conversation (if not for their learning) to exercise their ministry duly", be kept in the foreground, and not merely their position of leadership in the community in general, when such a position can easily be gained by mere professional or political affiliations. And when that condition is satisfied, that the ordinand should still be required to give an honest affirmative answer to the question, "Do you think in your heart that you be truly called . . .?" before he is ordained by the Bishop.

After ordination, he is a priest. The felicity with which he may conduct his affairs outside the worship of the Church may help to commend his ministrations to the laity of the local church. If so, it is a happy state of affairs. But he ministers not because of that, but because he is a priest.

St Peter's Vicarage,
St Leonards-on-Sea.

Yours faithfully,
Charles Williams.

EPISCOPACY

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

Your readers will have found in Mr Cosslett Quin's article much that was stimulating and much that was bewildering. What meaning, for instance, does he attach to the word "universal", when, having admitted that Christian genealogy is shared by Free Churchmen and even by Quakers, he goes on to say that episcopacy is its *universal* sign? And again, having found the autocephalous episcopal system not only among Anglicans but also amongst Old Catholics and Orthodox and the Lutherans of Sweden, he therefore recommends it as Catholic and *universal*. Is there no place for Presbyterians or Congregationalists in his universe?

But when he states that those who quote Chillingworth (as saying that the Bible only is the religion of Protestants) forget that by Protestant he meant the Church of England, and by Bible he meant "Scripture interpreted by Catholic written tradition", he deserves like episcopacy in his article to be "put into his place". The Preface to Chillingworth's *Religion of Protestants* explicitly states that it is not the peculiar defence of the Church of England but the common cause of all Protestants that is here undertaken by me (para. 39) (at the time of writing Chillingworth was unwilling to subscribe to the 39 Articles); and it ends with the noble and memorable plea:

"Let all men believe the Scripture and that only, and endeavour to believe it in the true sense, and require no more of others, and they shall find this not only a better but the only means to suppress heresy and restore unity. For he that believes the Scripture sincerely, and endeavours to believe it in the true sense, cannot possibly be an heretic: and if no more than this were required of any man to make him capable of the Church's communion, then all men so qualified, though they were different in opinion, yet notwithstanding any such difference must of necessity be one in communion"—not a word here about Catholic written tradition!

Mr Quin may speak for the greater part of the Church of England when he argues that episcopacy is in some sense necessary but at the same time comparatively unimportant. Chillingworth however held clearer and broader views, and should be allowed to speak for himself.

Yours faithfully,

ADRIAN CAREY.

ST PETER'S VICARAGE,
KEIGHLEY.

THE ATOMIC AGE

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

On the same day as I read in your October issue Mr Boycott's outburst of metaphysical joy, I read these words of the late W. H. V. Reade in *The Christian Challenge to Philosophy*:

"One rather ludicrous piece of evidence is the naïve delight sometimes exhibited by friends of religion when they hear that the solidity of matter is being whittled away by modern physics, as though Materialism would at any rate be less dangerous if only matter could be made decently thin. Possibly rations and war diet will be found to have helped! It makes, however, not the slightest difference whether matter is as hard as adamant, as stodgy as suet, as volatile as gas, as agile as electricity, or as naked as a mathematical formula. The only relevant question is whether it is self-existent or created by God; and this, as we cannot too often remind ourselves, is a question upon which natural science has nothing to say."

I was moved to look up Wittgenstein's closing words: "Whereof one cannot speak, thereof one must be silent."

Yours faithfully,

J. H. CHURCHILL.

KING'S COLLEGE,
STRAND, W.C.2.

BOOK REVIEWS

KINGS AND PROPHETS OF ISRAEL. By Adam C. Welch. Edited by Norman W. Porteous, with a Memoir by George S. Gunn. Lutterworth Press. 18s.

Not the least interesting part of this book for English and Anglican readers will be the prefatory memoir of the author by Dr Gunn. Welch is known as one of the most brilliant and original of recent Old Testament scholars, the propounder of daring and novel hypotheses which have perhaps not even yet had their full effect. But the account of his life reveals how closely his learned studies were integrated with a highly effective and thoroughly prepared ministry of preaching and with a pastoral concern for all sorts of people, grounded in a solid and typically Biblical Presbyterian piety. Above all, there emerges the very vital role which Welch, and others like him, played and continue to play in the central councils of the Church of Scotland. What led Welch to the important position of Convener of the General Assembly's Committee for the supervision of the Colleges of the Church—a body roughly equivalent to C.A.C.T.M.—was the continuing belief of his Church in the necessity of a solid University course in theology for its intending ministers. Anyone at all familiar with the situation in the Church of England will feel himself in a very different world and the contrast provokes thought.

The book itself consists of a series of studies of six great Old Testament figures—Moses, Saul, David, Amos, Hosea and Isaiah: it may thus be compared with such a work as Fleming James's *Personalities of the Old Testament*. Most of the chapters were originally delivered as lectures at New College, Edinburgh, to men returning from the First World War. Once again, the English reader will be struck by the character of these lectures. They are carefully written, with a close attention to rhetoric, and frequent attempts to illuminate the contemporary situation as it appeared to Welch. There is a minimum of discussion of initial problems: the author begins each lecture by stating his own position concisely and clearly, and then passes at once to his main concern, which is to bring out the character, fortunes and ultimate religious significance of the actual historical persons with whom he deals. As a result, these studies very adequately meet the needs of the beginner for whom they were originally intended. They will interest and stir him, and provide him with a sound introduction to much of the Old Testament, very little of which he will have to unlearn as he progresses.

It is probably inevitable, in the present climate of Old Testament scholarship, that Welch's outlook in these lectures should seem often somewhat old-fashioned—in a way, it is almost as difficult an undertaking to write a "life" of Isaiah as to write a "life" of Jesus. For this reason, perhaps the most interesting study is the first, "Moses in the Old Testament Tradition". This paper well illustrates, even in its title, the originality and independence of Welch's mind and his

ability to anticipate trends and insights in Old Testament study which have assumed great importance in recent years. But the same can be said, in greater or lesser degree, of all these studies, and it is this quality which gives them a permanent value, transcending that of a simple introduction. It is hardly to be expected that all the conclusions and judgments of any one Old Testament scholar should command universal assent, and this is certainly true of Welch: but time and again in these pages there occur extended discussions or pregnant sentences which by their clarity, incisiveness and sound sense present well-known evidence in a quite new light. One may instance the section on Hosea and the cult, or the whole lecture on Saul, which is not only a fine piece of writing—Professor Porteous in his preface says that no one ever listened to it without being deeply moved—but also effectively establishes the considerable social and political significance of a reign that is too often treated as a somewhat shadowy prefix to the history of the Hebrew monarchy. We may be grateful for the posthumous publication of these studies, the last fruit of a highly distinct and distinguished epoch of British Old Testament scholarship.

Oriel College,
Oxford. J. R. Porter.

The Birth of Christianity. By M. Goguel. Translated from the French by H. C. Snape. Allen and Unwin. 42s.

La Naissance du Christianisme is a history of the apostolic and sub-apostolic periods. It touches, but hardly explores, St Ignatius of Antioch. It is predominantly occupied with the evidence presented by the New Testament, taking up the story at the resurrection appearances. It takes many critical discussions for granted and aims at clear and complete statement. It is presumably aimed at the ordinary student of good intelligence, and one can only deplore that enough trouble has not been taken over the English version to make it serviceable to such readers. If your learning is sufficient for you to know what M. Goguel must have meant to say you will find it a stimulating experience to read him. But tutors who put the book into their pupils' hands must expect to find some very odd statements appearing in their pupils' essays. One should not be ungrateful to a translator who has accomplished an enormous task with a good deal of vigour. But it is miserable to reflect that, when a second eye could have picked out nine-tenths of the slips at a single reading, the trouble should have been spared and the boat so utterly thrown away for lack of a ha'p'orth of tar. Some of the mistakes are palpable, as when "Corinth" does duty for "Cerinthus"; others are more insidious, as when "Sans doute" in the sense of "One needn't hesitate to suppose" is rendered "There can be no doubt that" in contexts which make the reader rub his eyes. The position about translations is becoming intolerable. It is difficult for publishers to get their money back on them and the work is rushed.

The French original was published in 1946. The author's first

learned works came out about 1910. The vigour of his mind is undiminished, but his chronology will help us to understand him. Each learned generation has its characteristic merit and it is instructive to hear so Harnackian a voice as this, alive and speaking to us now. The old sturdy liberalism which disallows miracle and, in the historical field, grants no privilege to the object of faith simplifies its task, and is free to apply the standards of a ruthless historical candour. We may find the simplification illegitimate, and the question begged against faith; but we may still obtain startling lights on particular questions which a subtler theological approach would have been less likely to shed.

Since Harnack's time rationalism has certainly not decayed, but it has in large measure discovered itself to be no sort of Christianity. In Goguel the provoking contradictions of Harnack's attitude are still alive. On the historical evidence presented, a simple ethical spirituality might seem to be the only legitimate form of religion. On the other hand, nothing but high mystical Paulinism is accepted as true Christianity, and divergent forms are condemned by the standard of it. In the mind of this Christian scholar, true Christianity is not true.

While the historian thus makes war on his own heart he sets the persons of his history at war with one another, sharpening every antithesis between the several voices of primitive Christianity. We are reminded of Harnack's *Dogmengeschichte* again: of a dialecticism surely more German than French. Goguel sees the history of the primitive Church as a battle between three factions, those of Paul, Peter and James. St Peter and his friends came over, without quite seeing what they were doing, into the Pauline field and brought the weight of apostolic inheritance into the Gentile Church. St James and the Brethren of the Lord were left in possession of Palestine, and Palestinian Christianity faded out.

As an expositor of primitive Christian thought Goguel does not excel. He is lucid but he is not subtle. His best things are pieces of historical reconstruction, when, by an intuitive gift, he suddenly sees the way through the wood. For example, I would cite his account of St Paul's trials and of his fatal appeal to Caesar. St Luke's legal incomprehension and apologetic anxiety are brushed away like cobwebs from the picture. But in spite of such admirable passages Goguel's historical judgment is in general to be distrusted. He makes an initial division of his evidence into sheep and goats, dismisses the goats and places a confidence in his sheep which the subsequent development of the inquiry is not permitted to modify. This is not the way to write history, and, even on its own rationalistic assumptions, *The Birth of Christianity* is not a successful piece of history-writing.

AUSTIN FARRER.

TRINITY COLLEGE,
OXFORD.

II Corinthians. The Torch Bible Commentaries. By Richard Hanson. S.C.M. Press. 6s. 6d.

The Corinthian letters create peculiar problems of their own both for the exegete and for the intelligent reader to whom this series is addressed. This brief commentary is necessarily compressed, but is a welcome and often stimulating contribution to the literature of the subject.

The textual rearrangements now largely accepted are concisely dealt with in the short Introduction. It is assumed that the epistle really contains two letters or portions of them. In 1 Cor. 5. 9 we gather that Paul had written a previous letter which has been entirely lost, save probably for a fragment strangely inserted in 2 Cor. 6. 14–7. 1.

In dealing with the Corinthian letters, however, the primary task of the commentator is so far as possible to reconstitute the social, moral and religious background of the original readers. This process of reconstruction is all the more difficult inasmuch as much of the material has to be gathered either from Paul's own replies to questions that were put to him, from his dealings with situations that have been brought to his notice by Timothy and other messengers, or through casual information from individuals like "Chloe's people" who have visited the city. The process often becomes like that of overhearing a telephone conversation at one end and trying to imagine what is being said or done at the other.

One wishes that the treatment of the Corinthian background could have been amplified. The author points out in general terms that there always existed a tension between Jew and Gentile Christians, which "burns so obviously behind most of Paul's epistles" and is so much disguised or toned down in the Acts of the Apostles. He recognizes that this was due largely to "the moral failure of the non-Jewish religions of the day". This theme of the failure of Hellenistic Gentile religion needs development such as we find in Dr H. P. Nillson's epitome of his monumental work on Greek religion, translated under the title *Greek Piety*. The failure of Greek religion was more than a "failure of nerve". The Gentile Christian brought with him no conception of a religion in which a moral code comparable to the Mosaic Law was an integral element and carried with it absolute divine sanction. The Greek gods did not trouble themselves about the minutiae of daily life if only the ceremonial demands of the cult were satisfied. The oracular precept "Know thyself" never had a moral meaning for the Greek. It simply meant that the gods are unknown, far away and powerful, while man is weak and in their power. Religion had failed and the cure of souls was entrusted to the philosopher.

The author has presented the "Collection" for the poor in Jerusalem, of which Paul makes so much in 2 Cor. 8 and 9, in a fresh light. He relates it closely to the conference in Jerusalem (Gal 2. 1–10). There Paul speaks of it as something of which he did not need to be reminded and to which he attached considerable importance. Indeed he speaks of it as his own idea. Thus it appears as not merely an act

of benevolence suggested by Paul to the Gentile churches, but as primarily intended to heal the widening breach between Jew and Gentile. This peace-offering may well have failed in its real object, and certainly did not appease the Judaizing party which was responsible for the tension.

The reader will also be grateful for the interesting and often illuminating short dissertations on such subjects as "The sufferings of Christ" (1. 1–7); "Christ after the flesh" (5. 16). The dissertation on Apostleship is less convincing. Not only in this dissertation but from time to time are we told that Paul's conception of apostolic authority is derived from a conviction that, as apostle, "he stands between man and God". Surely Paul's whole conception of apostleship is fundamentally prophetic not priestly. The message is much more important than the bearer, as it was for the ancient prophet (2 Cor 4. 7). The message had a final authority inherent in itself. This commentary ends in strangely provocative fashion, with which it is impossible here to deal without contradicting nearly every sentence. We leave the exegete and encounter the determined propagandist of the doctrine of "the apostolic succession". The tone is unfortunate. "The apostolic minister today, as in St Paul's day, is in his apostolic functions not merely an ecclesiastical M.P."

Cherry Hinton, Cambridge. R. H. Strachan.

Preaching in a Scientific Age. By A. C. Craig. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

Preaching. By W. Russell Bowie. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, New York. $2.75.

The Warrack Lectures on Preaching are a valuable institution, with which we have nothing quite comparable in the Church of England. The five lectures given on this foundation by Dr A. C. Craig form a slight but significant volume. He writes with vigour and humour and is alive to the currents of thought of our time, but if any reader opens this book with the expectation that the author will counsel "restatement" or concession to the modern mind he will be disappointed. Dr Craig is, to use a phrase of his own, a "robust Christian preacher". His treatment of miracles shows none of the anxiety which preachers used to exhibit a quarter of a century ago to explain away the miraculous and "soft pedal" the marvellous. He adopts the position that the Bible is "a self-accrediting book, of which miracle is an integral part". His treatment of the Resurrection is on similar lines, and he quotes freely from Bishop Gore whose position he defends against minimizing attempts to get rid of the fact of the bodily Resurrection.

The book contains many pithy sayings which the preacher may profitably take to heart—e.g. "A principle is an abstraction which you apply: a person is one whom you confront." There is wisdom in the injunction, "Don't overhort your people; and don't underrate

their intelligence. Too much homily and too little instruction make an enervating diet."

Dr Bowie's work is on a more ambitious scale. It is not helped by the publisher's extravagant claims for it, but it contains much useful material. Dr Bowie is described as one of the greatest American preachers, and his opening chapters are not free from sermonizing. It is surprising to discover from his citations what an enormous number of books on Homiletics have come from U.S.A., the most famous being Phillips Brooks' *Lectures on Preaching*.

There is little trace of sacramental religion in this volume and it would have increased its value if some effort were made to relate the sermon to the Liturgy. Nevertheless, there is much help in this book for the preacher. The "sample" sermons presented are interesting examples of the care with which the skilled preacher builds up an effective message, and the specimen given of a poor sermon, worked over and made into a good one, is an exercise which might well be imitated.

Dr Bowie, like Dr Craig, quotes the rather unfair remark that the two great temptations of ministers are laziness and the habit of saying more than they have a right to say. We doubt both assertions: it is not laziness but preoccupation with secular affairs, finance (both personal and parochial) which prevents the pastor from giving his best attention to the construction of his sermons. And it is questionable whether he ought to confine his message to his personal experience; after all, he is the mouthpiece of the Church. But no doubt there are sad cases which prompt Dr Bowie's remark. "Some men approach the construction of their sermons with a cheerful belief in the nebular theory of creation. Scientists tell us that the earth was formed by the gradual solidifying of a huge amount of inchoate gas."

A bulletin from the "Centre Protestant d'Études", Geneva, is of interest as showing the attention which continues to be given in Protesant circles to the subject of preaching and the growing desire to integrate it with worship. At the third "séminaire pour laïques", five principles of preaching are laid down, among these being the requirement that it should be closely related to Baptism and the Eucharist. This is a welcome sign, and we could wish that our layfolk could receive similar guidance, for the greatest foe of sound and careful preaching is neither the laziness nor the superficiality of the preacher, nor the preoccupations which beset him, but the impatience of the laity with anything more than a sermonette. As someone has said: "Sermonettes will only make Christianettes."

BENHILTON. MARCUS DONOVAN.

AESTHETICS AND LANGUAGE. Edited by William Elton. Blackwell. 21s.

This is a collection of essays most of which have appeared in various philosophical journals in this country and the United States. By bringing them together the editor and publishers hope to make them more easily available to those who are not professional philo-

sophers, and to give them as examples of how aesthetics can be discussed in terms of the contemporary analytic interest in the uses of language. To read them should apply a corrective to the view sometimes canvassed by commentators in THEOLOGY that those who are interested in these methods can give only a crudely "emotive" account of language when it is used outside a scientific reference (in a narrow sense of "scientific"). Aesthetics is indeed a test case for a purely "emotive" theory of values, for there is no subject like it for rousing people not only to express strong feelings, on which they would be prepared to differ, but to violent argument. Differences on ethical and religious matters may be accepted mildly nowadays; not so differences in aesthetic judgment. Yet the philosophy of aesthetics competes with the philosophy of religion for the place of Cinderella among these studies. The writers of these papers are concerned about its "dreariness", and the obscurity of terminology and misuse of analogies which beset it. They all in various ways hold that these are largely the result of attempts to put forward universal theories about "the essential nature of Art", or "*the* aesthetic experience". They nearly all believe that it is meaningful to speak of some works of art as "good", but hold that there are many kinds of art and that the different kinds need not all be doing the same things. Hence in trying to say what it means to call them "good", very different considerations may be relevant in different contexts. The writers differ in their beliefs as to how far "criteria" can in fact be produced, even with restrictive reference to particular kinds of art, and how far these can be cited as *reasons* which support aesthetic judgments. Some of the writers suggest that though such criteria do not work as premises in deductive or evidence in inductive arguments, citing them may help us to look or listen more carefully. Thus they may support aesthetic judgments, but only in conjunction with actual perception in the particular case.

These essays succeed in clearing away a certain amount of dead wood. Their authors would no doubt admit that they have not yet said much which will be of help to a critic, beyond warning him to beware of what look like general theories but which in fact turn on points of verbal definition. Perhaps (as in the analogous case of the philosophy of religion) when these warnings have been heeded a cautious approach to theories with a more carefully defined scope will be possible.

DOROTHY EMMET.

MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY.

SHORTER NOTICES

THE SPIRIT OF ST FRANÇOIS DE SALES. By Jean Pierre Camus. Edited and newly translated by C. F. Kelley. Longmans. 8s. 6d.

AN ANTHOLOGY OF THE LOVE OF GOD. From the writings of Evelyn Underhill. Edited by Lumsden Barkway and Lucy Menzies. Mowbray. 12s. 6d.

SAINTS ALIVE! By Mervyn Charles-Edwards. Mowbray. 7s. 6d.

Mr Kelley's edition of *The Spirit of St François de Sales* is hagiography at its brilliant best. No one who desires to follow the examples of the Saints could fail to delight in it. The voluminous original work of Jean Pierre Camus, Bishop of Belley and most devoted spiritual son of St. François, is here translated for us, purged of irrelevances and conveniently arranged. Here is the "Devout Life" as it was lived; here is the "Love of God" in action in the words and deeds of the Saint whom to encounter is to love.

Why was he so beloved? "Everything François undertook he did with his whole mind and will, as if nothing else mattered for the time and as if it were the last thing he would be doing in this world", Camus tells us; and again, "He saw God in all things and all things in God."

There is one misprint on page 96.

This is a book to have and to give, to read and to re-read.

Evelyn Underhill was probably the greatest of contemporary devotional writers. In this anthology the editors seek to present the kernel of her teaching and they are to be congratulated on their achievement of this difficult task. Evelyn Underhill was at her best in her practical directions for living the inner life. Her more abstract teaching, which is well represented in the first half of this anthology, is not to be neglected, but it is overshadowed by her counsels on prayer. This she rightly sees as the one activity without which the soul must wither and die. "What is a real man of prayer?" she asks (p. 123). "A man of prayer is not necessarily a person who says a number of offices or abounds in detailed intercessions; but he is a child of God who is and knows himself to be in the deeps of his soul attached to God and is wholly and entirely guided by the Creative Spirit in his prayer and his work."

Mr Charles-Edwards' sermons preached in St Martin-in-the-Fields are certainly alive. They are imaginative—in print perhaps over-imaginative—but simple and practical. His message is that Saints are ordinary people following Christ in their ordinary lives. And we are to pray every day (he quotes the late Dom Bernard Clements), "O God, make *me* a Saint."

PETER GRAHAM.

ST ALBANS.

GOD IS LIGHT. By Edgar Primrose Dickie. Hodder and Stoughton. 17s. 6d.

THE LIVING FLAME. By Maurice Barnett. Epworth Press. 15s.

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN CHRISTIAN LIFE. By Père Gardeil, O.P. Blackfriars. 9s. 6d.

Dr Dickie's book *God is Light* is encyclopedic. If you want a paragraph on "Fears, right and wrong" or "Should the Church have a political program?", you will find it here. You will find, too, book reviews—of S. L. Frank's *God with Us*, of Austin Farrer's *The Glass*

of Vision. You will find a brief introduction to the thought of Wilhelm Dilthey.

The sub-title of the book is "studies in revelation and personal conviction". Perhaps "conversations" would be an apter word than "studies", for the author allows his mind to play freely over a wide field. It is all worth thinking about, but it leaves no clear-cut impression. We know that we have balanced liberalism and dogmatism, external authority and inner light, reason and revelation, givenness and growth. And just because they have been balanced, we feel that we have come near to the truth, though not to a simple statement of it.

The heart of the argument is that whereas personal conviction comes to men in a "luminous moment" discontinuous with their experiences of nature, conscience, and history, nevertheless in these experiences God is active, and they are valid as confirmatory. It is a plea for the recovery of all that was best in liberal theology, and above all for humility before God among theologians.

Criticism trembles before such a many-sided book, for if one statement seems open to objection, there will be a balancing statement elsewhere. If there is any unbalance, it is in the overstressing of the individual's *testimonium internum Spiritus Sancti* as against the *sensus communis fidelium*. Surely Councils and Creeds have some function in the scheme of revelation.

Mr Barnett's "study of the Gift of the Spirit in the New Testament" suffers from a loose style which makes it sometimes difficult to be sure what the author means. The first section collects instances of dreams, prophetic "possession", and glossolalia, from the two Testaments—though the question of dreams is not pursued, and the heading "Dream Fantasies" is inappropriate to much of the contents of the following pages. (Categories are altogether rather muddled: apocalyptic visions cannot be lumped together with Isaiah's vision in the Temple, and few would agree that John 17 is "ecstatic".) The second section deals with the contemporary explanation of ecstatic phenomena as the invasion of the Spirit, and is interesting chiefly for its sidelights: on the dissociation of the working of the Spirit from ecstatic phenomena in *Wisdom*, on the parallel and contrast between spirit- and demon-possession, on the distinction between Spirit as agent and as endowment in the New Testament, marked by the use or disuse of the definite article (though Matt. 1. 18 is an exception). The final section consists of three essays. The first discusses the Day of Pentecost, and decides for glossolalia and against the gift of foreign languages. The second discusses Corinthian glossolalia, and decides for Palestinian, not pagan, origin; and supports a conjecture of T. W. Manson that Paul was resisting an attempt by the Cephas party to impose a stereotyped "Local Pentecost" in every church. The last tries to find all there is in favour of Montanism, which is not much.

The author cannot resist occasional digs at ecclesiastical organization, but on the whole he is aware of the dangers of ecstatic phenomena, especially when intentionally induced. He sees that the

real test of the Spirit's presence is in quality of character. But only in half a footnote does he refer to the testing of spirits by doctrinal norms, which is approved in both Testaments.

There is no hankering after ecstatic phenomena in Père Gardeil's *The Holy Spirit in Christian Life*. These retreat addresses (like many) lose almost everything in print. Without the speaker they seldom kindle into flame. The book follows the formal plan of taking each of the sevenfold gifts in turn and interspersing addresses on these with others on the Beatitudes, each Beatitude being forcibly related to one of the gifts. It would be wrong to expect any particular originality in retreat addresses, but it is rather surprising to find the work of the Spirit in the corporate life of the Christian fellowship so wholly ignored. The book is marred by some grammatical errors and oddities of style. GRAHAM NEVILLE.

SHEFFIELD.

A CHRISTIAN ECONOMY. By W. G. Peck. S.P.C.K. 17s. 6d.

THE WORLD AND THE FAITH. By Maurice B. Reckitt. Faith Press. 10s. 6d.

These two collections of essays reflect a concern for the life of society which is at once Anglican and Catholic. This concern has manifested itself during the last twenty-five years in various groups which have owed a great deal to Dr Peck and Mr Reckitt. If these essays should stimulate still further the political responsibility of Christians—and I cannot conceive that anyone should read them without being thus stimulated—we shall be once more in their debt. Yet having read the books I am a little puzzled as to what precisely their authors intend. Both say a good deal about social responsibility, about current political trends, about the virtues and the dangers of the Welfare State. Both are splendidly lucid and do not overstate their case. But what their case lacks is political content. At the end of it all I am not quite clear what I am supposed to do. Work against an absolute conception of the State, for a transformation of the Trade Unions, says Dr Peck. And what Mr Reckitt has to say is not too dissimilar. But how am I to work for these? What political party is going to listen to me? And politics in this country is an affair of parties.

It is only too evident that the living political thinking that is being done in this country has had all too little to do with Anglo-Catholic Sociology. Hence the actual political choices with which the Labour and Conservative Parties confront us hardly touch the issues raised by Dr Peck and Mr Reckitt. It is this, I think, that gives to Anglo-Catholic Sociology its parochial air. There is no sense of grappling with the actual in, say, the form of concrete legislative proposals. And there appears to be a certain lack of awareness as to what is and what is not practicable. I find, for instance, in these books no reference to Mr George Goyder's profoundly stimulating proposals for reforming the legal structure of the limited liability

company so that the company shall be responsible in law to workers and management as well as to the shareholders. The absence of these or similar discussions from these essays creates a sense of the political isolation both of the authors and of their potential audience. This isolation, I would suggest, springs from two causes.

First, there is a well-argued defence of the concept of Christian Sociology in both books. But both contain no reference to the work of contemporary social scientists, and neither author attempts any real use of sociological evidence. Secondly, there is no sense of the living reality of industrial conflict in our society. This has become essentially a conflict between management and the worker and not, as the Marxist would have it, a conflict between the owner and the worker. It is not so much a conflict over dividing the fruits of industry between wages and profits, as a conflict between those who have learned through the necessity of poverty to grasp at short-term advantage in wages and those who in the interests of efficiency and future standards of living have to try and use profits for the re-equipment of industry. But the conflict is there. There are attempts to solve it through various schemes of joint ownership and joint planning of policy. They are on a small scale, tentative, and experimental. Yet the importance of these secular schemes to our economic future is far greater than any theorizing, whether Christian or not, can ever be.

Alasdair C. MacIntyre.
Manchester University.

Origen's Treatise on Prayer. Translated with an Introduction and Notes by E. G. Jay. S.P.C.K. 27s. 6d.

Dr Jay has made a good contribution to the study of Origen in this edition of the *Treatise on Prayer*. Origen's style does not invite beautiful English in his translator, but Dr Jay has produced a capable and smoothly flowing version, adorned with notes that are always full and usually appropriate but sometimes a little obvious. Many students will find the note on p. 127 on Origen's use of the words *ousia* and *hupokeimenon* particularly informative. The translation is preceded by a brief account of prayer in the Early Church in general and in Origen in particular, and an interesting and valuable description of the manuscripts and editions of the *Treatise*. The work ends with a useful Appendix on the word *epiousios*.

It is unfortunate that no mention is anywhere made in the book of the recently discovered *Conversation with Heracleides*, for not only does this throw more light on prayer in the Eucharist in Origen's day, but it also has much to say about Origen's attitude to the equation of the soul with the blood, discussed on p. 191 of Dr Jay's book. It is surprising too that Dr Jay can write a note on Prayer and the Saints (pp. 43–4) without observing that it is morally certain that Origen would have discouraged prayer to the saints; *Against Celsus* V. 11 and *Homilies on Ezekiel* IV. 8 (even if we disregard the *Treatise on Prayer* XV. 2) make this conclusion almost irresistible.

But these omissions need not prevent us from welcoming this work as a notable addition to the list of Origen's works available in English.

R. P. C. Hanson.

University of Nottingham.

The Founding of Cuddesdon. By Owen Chadwick. Obtainable from Cuddesdon College, Oxford. Cloth 10s., paper 7s. 6d. (postage 6d.).

Mark well the title of this book. It exactly describes the intention so admirably achieved by its author—but here is no history of Cuddesdon, unless it be Volume I. In the Epilogue Mr Chadwick writes that "a theological college has (if it is lucky) no history". For once I entirely disagree with him. Cuddesdon is admittedly a lucky and most lovable place, but did its history finish twenty years before our generation of students (and we are getting old) left the nursery? There is a tantalizing sentence on the last page with a passing reference to many who, in our humble opinion, themselves made history, but all they are given is one epithet apiece—"the grave Johnson . . . the bubbling Seaton . . . the incomparable George Belcher . . ."—followed by a lame excuse for stopping the story where the fun begins: "If we say nothing of these men, it is *what they would prefer.*" The same excuse might be made for the exclusion of Wilberforce, Liddon, Golightly, King and company, and then there would be no written history at all. This silence is not what Mr Chadwick's *readers* would prefer. He would have done better to give us the reason, sound enough if disappointing: he set out to tell only of Cuddesdon's foundation. That he has done extremely well.

Those who want a convincing portrait of the great Liddon in his early days as Vice-Principal will certainly find one here, and they are bound to admire it though the features are heavy and there is little or no humour to lighten them. A footnote tells us a legend of how he found a little girl crying in the village. He knelt down beside her and pleaded with her to try to "reconsider the situation" and he was sure she would discover "alleviating circumstances".

Those who enjoy watching winter passing into spring will delight to see the atmosphere of Cuddesdon changing with the advent of Edward King. "It was as if we had fallen under a streak of sunlight, that flickered and danced and laughed and turned all to colour and gold." That is Scott Holland's characteristic description of the experience.

If history ends with sunlight and the cessation of storm and controversy we have no more to say; otherwise we want Volume II from the same scholarly and entertaining pen.

Eric Hamilton: Bp.

The Deanery,
Windsor Castle.

THE ANGLO-SAXON MISSIONARIES IN GERMANY, being the Lives of SS. Willibrord, Boniface and others. Translated and edited by C. H. Talbot. Sheed and Ward. 16s.

St Willibrord, the Apostle of the Netherlands, and St Boniface, the Apostle of Germany, were two great Englishmen, one from the north and the other from the south, who have been strangely neglected. St Willibrord's very name has been almost forgotten, and St Boniface, who perhaps did more to influence European history than any Englishman that has ever lived, is seldom mentioned among our national heroes and saints. The twelfth centenary of the martyrdom of St Boniface is being kept this year in Holland and next year in England (the exact date is not certain), and this translation of his life and those of his predecessor and associates is timely. The life of St Willibrord was written by Alcuin, and that of St Boniface by a priest named Willibald at the request of St Boniface's immediate successor at Mainz. They are followed by a selection from St Boniface's correspondence with popes, kings, bishops and others by Bishop Willibald's (not the author of the Life of St Boniface) account of his pilgrimage to Jerusalem, which is the only eighth-century description of the Holy City that we have, and by the Lives of SS. Sturm, Leoba and Lebuin. Sturm was converted in boyhood by St Boniface and was the first Abbot of Fulda, where St Boniface was buried. Leoba was a nun of Wimborne, well known for her holiness, and St Boniface sent for her to be the first Abbess of his convent at Bischofsheim. St Lebuin was an English missionary who went to Utrecht after the martyrdom of St Boniface and later preached among the Saxons in North-west Germany.

The translation is smooth and easy to read. It is strange that the editor does not refer to Bishop G. F. Browne's *Boniface and his Companions*, which deals thoroughly with the subject. We observe that the popes did not yet claim to be "Vicar of Christ", but only "Vicar of Peter". These documents throw much light on medieval missionary problems, some of which are still with us.

WINCHESTER. C. B. MOSS.

YARNS ON WESSEX PIONEERS. By Arthur G. Willis and Ernest H. Hayes. Religious Education Press. 4s.

Mr Willis, a Dorchester schoolmaster, set out to write a book for use in religious instruction in Dorset schools which should show the contribution made by Dorset men to the introduction and spread of Christianity in England. He found, however, that the local history was inseparable from that of the whole of Wessex, and his book gives a sketch of that history from, say, 500–1100 A.D. The plan of the book is to present the history in the form of "yarns" constructed by Mr Hayes, the author of the R.E.P. Yarns Series. To each yarn Mr Willis adds a set of questions for discussion and a set of historical notes. These notes, as a whole, form a concise history of Wessex over the period of the yarns.

The book contains two handy maps, a time-chart, many source

references and numerous very useful illustrations. The authors confess that some of their material is of doubtful historical value, but they have contrived to present the story of the struggle between Christianity and paganism in Wessex with so much local interest that young persons who use the book should be proud of their native place and themselves inspired to Christian adventure.

NEWTON FERRERS. G. W. KINGCOME.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE INNER LIFE. By Lumsden Barkway. Mowbrays. 6s.

Bishop Barkway writes with the simplicity and clarity which can spring only from wisdom, directing our attention to the inner citadel where God dwells: a citadel which remains secure amidst the insecurity of our century. He speaks of the life we live in that citadel; of the place of mind, heart and will; of repentance, faith, love; of poverty, chastity, obedience; the sacraments; interior prayer. Everything that is said on these subjects is from the perspective which sees the essentials of the spiritual life and so leaves us with a real guide, not with a confusing or overwhelming treatise. It is written, moreover, in language which can be understood by those to whom some traditional language is but a foreign tongue; yet the author never departs from the living tradition of prayer. It is a book for our own age which preserves the wisdom of all the ages. It can be used because it really *introduces* us to the inner life and does not leave us merely talking about it. HEATHER WILEMAN.

PRAYER BOOK REVISION IN ENGLAND 1800–1900. By R. C. D. Jasper. S.P.C.K. 13s. 6d.

The history of Prayer Book Revision in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries has often been written; A. E. Peaston has described the eighteenth-century movement; Mr Jasper's recent edition of Bishop Frere's letters covers the period from 1900 to 1930; and the present work fills the gap from 1800 to 1900. At the beginning of the nineteenth century demands for revision were concentrated almost entirely upon the removal of a small number of phrases embodying repugnant doctrinal ideas, such as the form of absolution in the Visitation of the Sick. Since these were the ideas by which the Tractarians set most store, they committed themselves to an intransigent defence of every jot and tittle of the Prayer Book. Only against this background can we understand the extraordinary intensity of feeling aroused by Archbishop Tait's attempts to modify the wording, use, or interpretation of the Athanasian Creed. All these attempts were frustrated by determined Tractarian resistance, though, as Mr Jasper points out, the Creed has none the less since declined into desuetude.

After 1850, ceremonial innovations began to cause controversy, and revision of the rubrics was contemplated as a means of allowing or prohibiting the practices of the "Ritualists". Once again the text

of the Prayer Book remained unaltered. This part of the story is dominated by the famous legal battles between the Church Association and the English Church Union, and it is perhaps a pity that Mr Jasper has not overstepped the strict limits of his subject and supplied a rather fuller background.

In general, then, revision was the means to doctrinal or ceremonial ends; for revision on purely liturgical grounds there was little demand. In a most interesting chapter Mr Jasper summarizes essays by J. M. Neale, R. F. Littledale, and an anonymous writer in the *Church Quarterly Review*, whose identity it would be interesting to know. Here, for the first time since Cosin and the Nonjurors, we find liturgical reform advocated for its own sake; these men shared their predecessors' regard for the 1549 book, and drew even more freely on the Latin rite. Many of their proposals have a familiar ring, and ultimately found a place in the 1928 book (this point might have been illustrated in detail).

Mr Jasper has traced intelligible lines of development through a mass of obscure material, much of which must have been extremely tedious to read; and any dryness inherent in the subject is mitigated by his skilful use of diaries and letters, which illuminate the personalities involved in the liturgical *minutiae*.

C. J. Cuming.

St John's College,
Durham.

Christ the Conqueror. By Ragnar Leivestad. S.P.C.K. 25s.

Some twenty years ago Aulen opened up new horizons for many of us with his *Christus Victor*. Though his sketch of the New Testament evidence was slight he maintained that the theme of conflict with, and victory over, cosmic powers was a prominent feature in the New Testament. Now comes *Christ the Conqueror*, a study of the ideas of conflict and victory in the New Testament. Whatever else may be said of it, none can complain that the treatment is slight.

It becomes plain that Aulen has exaggerated the prominence of the theme of conflict with cosmic powers. His main contention, however, that God is both Reconciler and Reconciled remains unshaken.

The larger part of the book consists of exegetical examination of the New Testament material, very full and thorough and frequently illuminating. But it is hard work and breathless work to follow Dr Leivestad. The going is easier in the second part, where he classifies his findings. He finds the following conflict motifs: conflict with and victory over the demons, "traditional apocalyptic", moral-martyrological, forensic, and dramatic-mythical. In dealing with the moral-martyrological he has a valuable section, connecting the victorious death of Christ with the struggle of the Church, the eschatological expectation of the Church and its present humiliation.

This is an important book. It certainly cannot be absorbed in one reading, and there are statements and theories which will not be

readily accepted. But it must be reckoned with. A curious aberration diminishes its value. The author tells us that it is not a translation from the Norwegian, but that he has himself written it in English. His mastery of English is remarkable. (Perhaps it is his mastery of contemporary English that has seduced him into writing "disinterested" when he means "uninterested".) Despite his mastery, he cites German authorities in German, to the frustration and confusion of readers who have no German. Perhaps this can be remedied in future editions.

F. C. Synge.

The Deanery,
George, S. Africa.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

Abingdon Press (New York): Elmer A. Leslie, *Jeremiah* ($4.75).

Blackfriars Publications: Reginald Buckler, O.P., *The Perfection of Man by Charity* (13s. 6d.).

Church Historical Society (Philadelphia): Nelson R. Burr, *The Anglican Church in New Jersey* ($10).

Church Information Board: J. D. Johns, *Belief, Life and Worship: a book of Anglican teaching for senior groups and Bible classes* (4s.).

Desclée et Cie: P. van Imschoot, *Théologie de l'Ancien Testament, Tome I: Dieu* (n.p.).

Edinburgh House Press: R. P. C. Hanson, *The Summons to Unity* (3s. 6d.).

Éditions de Chevetogne: *1054–1954 L'Église et les Églises: neuf siècles de douloureuse séparation entre l'Orient et l'Occident*, Vol. I (240 Belgian francs).

Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura (Rome): Tiburtius Gallus, S.J., *Interpretatio Mariologica Protoevangelii Posttridentina ab anno 1661 usque ad 1854* (Lire 4,000).

Longmans: Dom Illtyd Trethowan, *An Essay in Christian Philosophy* (12s. 6d.).

Mowbray: A Religious of C.S.M.V. (Ed.), *Saint Bernard on the Christian Year: Selections from his Sermons* (10s. 6d.); F. L. Cross, *I Peter—A Paschal Liturgy* (3s. 6d.); *The Word of God in the Life of Man* [study schemes and sermon courses prepared for the dioceses of London, Southwark, Chelmsford, Chichester and St Albans] (9s. 6d.); Shirley Hughson, O.H.C., *Lord, Hear My Prayer* [a book of daily meditations previously entitled *The Voice of my Prayer*, revised and expanded] (10s. 6d.).

St Anthony's Press (London): G. W. O. Addleshaw, *The Development of the Parochial System from Charlemagne to Urban II* (2s. 6d.).

S.C.M. Press: H. G. G. Herklots, *Looking at Evanston* (3s. 6d.); Hedley Hodkin, *The Saving Name* (7s. 6d.); W. O. Lester Smith (Ed.), *The School as a Christian Community* (4s. 6d.); Hugh C. Warner, *Theological Issues of Contraception* [Reprint of article in Theology, January, 1954] (6d.); A. M. Hunter, *Interpreting St Paul's Gospel* (10s. 6d.).

Sheed and Ward: John C. H. Wu, *The Interior Carmel: The Threefold Way of Love* (12s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: *Church Commissioners for England: Sixth Annual Report* (1s.).

Valentine, Mitchell and Co.: A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes, new studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls* [an up-to-date sequel to the book reviewed in Theology in September, 1953] (10s. 6d.).

INDEX TO VOLUME LVII

JANUARY TO DECEMBER, 1954

PAGE

Acoustics of Churches, The 58
ALLEN, G. F. 404
American Letters 169, 283
ARGYLE, A. W. 444
Atheist and his Spooks, The 51
Atomic Age, The 292, 387, 464

BAILEY, S. 322
Bangalore Brotherhood of St Peter 257
BELGION, M. 51
BENNETT, F. 128
BEZZANT, J. S. 209
BLENKIN, H. 216

BOOK REVIEWS (see also "Shorter Notices"):

Andrews, *The Polish National Catholic Church* (R. S. Bosher) . . 74
Armstrong, *Plotinus* (P. Mairet) 394
Aubert, *Problèmes de l'unité chrétienne* (T. S. Garrett) . . . 76
Bainton, *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century* (N. Sykes) . . 110
Balthasar, *Thérèse of Lisieux* (H. W. Lawton) 436
Barth, *Against the Stream* (F. W. Dillistone) 347
Bartsch (Ed.), *Kerygma and Myth* (J. S. Bezzant) 209
Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Future* (D. R. Jones) 390
Benoît, *Le baptême chrétien* (J. C. Sladden) 66
Bonhoeffer, *Letters from Prison* (C. C. West) 33
Bouyer, *Du Protestantisme à l'Église* (Editorial) 361
Bowie, *Preaching* (M. Donovan) 469
Bright, *The Kingdom of God* (F. C. Synge) 432
Brinton, *Friends for 300 Years* (M. Hennell) 67
Broad, *Religion, Philosophy and Psychical Research* (M. Belgion) . 51
Bromiley, *Baptism and the Anglican Reformers* (S. Bailey) . . 349
Brown, *A History of the English Clergy* (W. G. Addison) . . . 113
Bullock, *The History of Ridley Hall* (M. Hennell) 150
Burn-Murdoch, *The Development of the Papacy* (E. Giles) . . . 308
Burnaby, *Education, Religion, Learning and Research* (Editorial) . 1
Butler, *The Church and Infallibility* (R. P. C. Hanson) . . . 378
Cailliet, *The Christian Approach to Culture* (R. Tree) . . . 119
Carey (Ed.), *The Historic Episcopate* (N. Sykes) 272
Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture (H. W. Montefiore) . . 286
Chadwick, *Origen: Contra Celsum* (R. P. C. Hanson) 64
Clement, *The S.P.C.K. and Wales* (Bishop of St Davids) . . . 435
Copleston, *A History of Philosophy* (C. C. J. Webb) 191
Craig, *Preaching in a Scientific Age* (M. Donovan) 469
Cranston, *World Faith* (A. Hanson) 75
Cullmann, *Peter* (R. H. Fuller) 28
Dancy, *I Maccabees* (J. A. Emerton) 346
Davies, *Henry Phillpotts* (Editorial) 321
de Blank, *The Parish in Action* (G. L. Phillips) 396
de Jonge, *The Testaments of the XII Patriarchs* (D. R. Jones) . 390
Dix, *The Image and Likeness of God* (F. P. Harton) 309
Eeg-Lofsson, *The Conception of the Inner Light* (H. G. Wood) . . 350
Ehrhardt, *The Apostolic Succession* (J. E. L. Oulton) . . . 107
Elliott-Binns, *The Early Evangelicals* (G. Rogers) 193
Elton (Ed.), *Aesthetics and Language* (D. M. Emmet) . . . 470
Ewing, *Ethics* (K. G. Collier) 144
Fairweather and Hettlinger, *Episcopacy and Reunion* (N. Sykes) . 272
Fison, *The Christian Hope* (Editorial) 81
Furse, *Stand Therefore!* (E. K. C. Hamilton) 36

PAGE

Gallus, *Interpretatio Mariologica* (C. W. Quin) 89
George, *Communion with God in the New Testament* (J. D. McCaughey) 433
Goguel, *The Birth of Christianity* (A. M. Farrer) 466
Gollwitzer, *Unwilling Journey* (C. C. West) 152
Graves and Podro, *The Nazarene Gospel Restored* (C. S. C. Williams) 106
Hanson, *II Corinthians* (R. H. Strachan) 468
Hanson, *Origen's Doctrine of Tradition* (H. Chadwick) 189
Hart and Carpenter, *The Nineteenth-Century Parson* (W. G. Addison) 312
Hartshorne and Reese, *Philosophers Speak of God* (M. F. Wiles) . . 235
Hastings and Nicholl (Ed.), *Selection I* (R. G. Lunt) 72
Houghton, *Amy Carmichael* (A. Hanson) 75
Hughson, *Spiritual Letters* (B. M. Oman) 195
Laver, *The First Decadent* (H. R. T. Brandreth) 456
Leslie, *Cardinal Gasquet* (Editorial) 121
Leuba, *New Testament Pattern* (W. Nicholls) 276
Mackinnon (Ed.), *Christian Faith and Communist Faith* (A. Ecclestone) 31
Mackinnon, *On the Notion of a Philosophy of History* (M. F. Wiles) . 392
McNabb, *Faith and Prayer* (F. P. Harton) 309
Martin, *Puritanism and R. Baxter* (H. R. McAdoo) 397
Mascall, *Corpus Christi* (D. L. Edwards) 96
Maycock, *Chronicles of Little Gidding* (E. G. Knapp-Fisher) . . . 434
Mellone, *Leaders of Early Christian Thought* (N. Q. King) . . . 429
Milburn, *Early Christian Interpretations of History* (N. Q. King) . 429
Moore, *Some Main Problems of Philosophy* (M. B. Foster) . . . 233
Moorman, *A History of the Church of England* (N. Sykes) . . . 230
Moss, *What do we Mean by Reunion?* (T. S. Garrett) 76
Mozley, *Coverdale and his Bibles* (L. C. Stanbridge) 35
Newbigin, *The Household of God* (W. Nicholls) 276
Nott, *The Emperor's Clothes* (M. Belgion) 237
Parker, *The Gospel before Mark* (V. Taylor) 228
Paul, *The English Philosophers* (T. R. Milford) 306
Peel and Carlson, *The Writings of R. Harrison and R. Browne* (N. Sykes) 110
Pieper, *The End of Time* (M. F. Wiles) 392
Pontifex and Trethowan, *The Meaning of Existence* (R. Tree) . . . 30
Prayer Book Studies I–V (B. J. Wigan) 422
Price, *Some Aspects of the Conflict between Science and Religion* (J. H. Oldham) 69
Raven, *Experience and Interpretation* (D. L. Edwards) 98
Reynolds, *The Evangelicals at Oxford* (G. Rogers) 193
Rouse and Neill (Ed.), *A History of the Ecumenical Movement* (Editorial) 201
Rupp, *The Righteousness of God* (W. O. Chadwick) 135
Seynaeve, *Newman's Doctrine on Holy Scripture* (L. Bouyer) . . . 116
Short, *The Bible and Modern Medicine* (W. D. M. Paton) 315
Simon, *A Theology of Salvation* (E. W. Heaton) 109
Smedes, *The Incarnation: trends in modern Anglican thought* (J. A. T. Robinson) 147
Smith, *Tudor Prelates and Politics* (D. L. Edwards) 149
Spencer, *Politics of Belief* (J. P. T. Bury) 311
Speyr, *The Word* (D. W. Allen) 71
Stace, *Religion and the Modern Mind* (K. G. Collier) 144
Stromberg, *Religious Liberalism* (W. G. Addison) 232
Sundkler, *Church of South India* (J. Grimes) 268
Sykes, *The English Religious Tradition* (Bishop of Winchester) . . 115
Thouless, *Authority and Freedom* (G. F. Allen) 344
Tillich, *The Courage to Be* (W. W. S. March) 68
Tournier, *A Doctor's Case Book* (W. D. M. Paton) 315
Vaganay, *Le problème synoptique* (C. S. C. Williams) 430

PAGE

Vidler, *Prophecy and Papacy* (J. P. T. Bury) 186
Watkin, *Poets and Mystics* (S. L. Bethell) 117
Watts, *Myth and Ritual in Christianity* (G. Every) 229
Weber, *Karl Barth's Dogmatics* (F. W. Dillistone) 347
Webster, *Joshua Watson* (M. Webster) 351
Welch, *Kings and Prophets of Israel* (J. R. Porter) 465
Welch, *The Trinity in Contemporary Theology* (H. Balmforth) . . 146
Williams, *The Acts of the Apostles* (W. R. F. Browning) . . . 313
Yerkes, *Sacrifice* (N. H. Snaith) 188
Young, *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (J. A. Emerton) . . 346

BOYCOTT, W. S. 99
BRANDRETH, H. R. T. 456

CHADWICK, W. O. 135
CHANDRAN, J. R. 242
CHELLAPPA, D. 250
Church of South India 241, 343, 427
CLARKE, W. K. L. 222
Clothes in Church 128
Contraception, Theological Issues of 8, 105, 139
Correspondence . . 24, 61, 103, 139, 182, 225, 265, 304, 343, 386, 426, 461
Crockford 281

DAMMERS, A. H. 43
DANIÉLOU, J. 83
DAVIES, R. T. 172
"De-Mythologizing" the Gospel 209
Demythologizing: the Problem of Validity 415
DONOVAN, M. 178

EDWARDS, D. L. 94
ELPHICK, W. 257
Evanston and Minneapolis 283, 404
Evidence of Things not Seen, The 133
Exit the Exhortation 383

Fathers and the Scriptures, The 83
FEIBUSCH, H. 3
FENTON, J. C. 20

GORDON, E. H. 46
GRAY, G. F. S. 368

HANSON, R. P. C. 378
HEPBURN, R. W. 417
HICKIN, L. 447
HILDER, G. F. 452
HODKIN, H. 58
Huysmans, The Strange Life of J. K. 456
Hymnals and History 178, 267

"I Beheld His Glory" 46
Infallibility, A Modern Defence of 378

Keble, An Uupublished Letter from John 101
KELLEY, A. D. 283

Last Supper, The Day of 60, 265, 343
LEE, E. K. 410
Letter of James Hurdis to William Cowper 222
LONDON, BISHOP OF 203

PAGE

Low Mass need not be so Low 14, 103
Luther Reconsidered 135

Mariology and the Bible 89
Massing Priests 161, 304, 386, 462
MAY, P. D. 383
Minneapolis and Evanston 283, 404
Missionary Methods in an English Parish 296, 387, 426, 441
MONTEFIORE, H. W. 286
MONTIZAMBERT, E. 169
More about Parables 339, 461
Mural Paintings in Churches 3

Ordination of Women to the Priesthood, The 330, 428, 452
Our Legislative Assemblies 203
Overseers and Bishops 368

PACKARD, K. 14
PATON, M. J. M. 335
Post-graduate Clergy Training in the U.S.A. 169
Power of Jesus is like . . ., The 43, 142, 339, 461
Promises 335
Public Baptism of Infants: revised orders 447
Putting Episcopacy in its Place 362, 463

QUIN, C. W. 89, 362

Revisions of the Eucharistic Rite in the Anglican Communion . 123, 163, 265
River Line, The 172
Roman Catholics and the Bible 286

Sacraments and the Fourth Gospel, The 410
SANSBURY, C. K. 123, 163
SCHIFF, L. M. 262
Science, Sin and Sacrament 94
Shorter Notices . . 37, 78, 153, 197, 238, 279, 317, 352, 399, 401, 438, 471
STALLEY, F. E. 133
Structure and Plot in St Matthew's Gospel 20

TAYLOR, V. 60
Teleology and Eschatology 444
THRALL, M. E. 330
Transatlantic Liturgy 422
Two Milking Stools, The 99
Two Ways to God—or One? 216, 305

WANSEY, J. C. 296
WARNER, H. C. 8
WELBOURN, F. B. 161
WIGAN, B. J. 422
WILES, M. F. 339
Woman and the Church's Lay Ministry 322
Women and the Ministry 452

YARNOLD, G. D. 292

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LTD.
GUILDFORD AND LONDON